DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 263	95	TM 005 413

TITLE	Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U.S. Office of Education: FY 1973.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	[73]
NOTE	315p.; For related documents see ED 065 738, ED 082 300, and ED 115 655
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$16.73 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education Programs; American Indians; *Annual Reports; Compensatory Education Programs; Demonstration Programs; Early Childhood Education; Educational Legislation; *Educational Programs; Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; Handicapped; Higher Education; Library Programs; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Special Education; Teacher Education; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Office of Education

ABSTRACT

This annual evaluation report on educational programs administered by the Office of Education for fiscal year 1973 updates and extends last year's report and incorporates the results of the studies completed as of June 30, 1973 as well as new information derived from program operations, data collections and monitoring activities. Included in each program description is its legislative authorization, its funding history, its purpose and operational approach, its scope, information about its effectiveness, current or planned evaluation studies, and sources of evaluation data. Where results from completed formal evaluation studies are not available, program operating data, audit reports, project director evaluations and reports, and similar data are reported. Specific programs are organized under these headings: elementary and secondary education programs, education for the handicapped programs, vocational and adult education programs, higher education programs, education professions development programs, library programs, educational technology programs, special demonstration programs, and Indian education programs. (RC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123263

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

FY 1973

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Office of Education
Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation

TM005 413

[redacted]

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS: FY 1973

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction

A. Background 1
B. History of Evaluation in the Office of Education 1
C. Federal Role in Education 3
D. Overview of the Effectiveness of OE Programs and Related Evaluation Strategies 5
E. Highlights of New Findings 26
F. Studies in Process 33

Detailed Descriptions and Effectiveness Information 46

A. Elementary and Secondary Education Programs 47

1. Education of Disadvantaged Children 48
2. Supplementary Educational Centers and Services 55
3. Strengthening State Departments of Education 61
4. Bilingual Education 64
5. Follow Through 68
6. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Maintenance and Operation 72
7. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Construction 76
8. Emergency School Assistance 80
9. Training and Advisory Services, Title IV CRA 88

B. Education for the Handicapped Programs 92

1. State Grant Program 93
2. Aid to States for Education of Handicapped Children in State Operated Schools 96
3. Regional Resource Centers 99
4. Deaf/Blind Centers 101
5. Early Childhood Education 103
6. Special Education Manpower Development 105
7. Recruitment and Information 108
8. Innovation and Development 110
9. Media Services and Captioned Films 112
10. Specific Learning Disabilities 114

C. Vocational and Adult Education Programs 116

1. Vocational and Technical Education: Basic Grants to States 117

Page

C. Vocational and Adult Education Programs Cont'd.

2. Vocational and Technical Education: Programs for Students with Special Needs 127
3. Vocational and Technical Education: Research and Training 129
4. Vocational and Technical Education: Exemplary Programs .. 132
5. Vocational and Technical Education: Consumer and Homemaking Education 135
6. Vocational and Technical Education: Cooperative Education Programs 138
7. Vocational and Technical Education: Work Study Programs 143
8. Vocational and Technical Education: Curriculum Development 146
9. Adult Basic Education: Basic Grants to States 148
10. Adult Basic Education: Special Projects 151
11. Adult Basic Education: Teacher Training 154
12. Manpower Development and Training Programs 156

D. Higher Education Programs 161

1. Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program 162
2. Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grants Program 165
3. College Work-Study Program 167
4. Cooperative Education Program 171
5. Guaranteed Student Loan Program 173
6. National Direct Student Loan Program 177
7. Upward Bound Program 180
8. Educational Talent Search Program 185
9. Special Services for Disadvantaged Students 188
10. Stengthening Developing Institutions 192
11. Annual Interest Grants 195
12. Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities 197
13. State Administration and Planning 199
14. Language Training and Area Studies 201
15. Fulbright-Hays Act 204
16. Community Service and Continuing Education Program 206
17. Land Grant Colleges and Universities Program 208
18. College Teacher Fellowships 210
19. Higher Education Personnel Fellowships 212
20. EPDA, Part E Institutes 215
21. College Personnel Development, Fellowships for the Disadvantaged 218
22. College Personnel Development, Allen J. Ellender Fellowships 219

Page

D. Higher Education Programs Cont'd.

23. Veterans Cost of Instruction Program.................... 220
24. Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities........... 222

E. Education Professions Development Programs................. 224

1. Teacher Corps Program................................... 225
2. Educational Leadership Program.......................... 231
3. Career Opportunities Program............................ 234
4. Early Childhood Program................................. 238
5. Exceptional Children Program............................ 240
6. Training of Teacher Trainers Program.................... 243
7. Pupil Personnel Services Program........................ 245
8. Urban/Rural School Development Program.................. 247
9. Teacher Training in Developing Institutions Program...... 249
10. Vocational Education Personnel Program.................. 252

F. Library Programs.. 256

1. Library Services.. 257
2. Public Library Constuction.............................. 262
3. Interlibrary Cooperative Services....................... 264
4. Academic Library Resources.............................. 266
5. Career Training - Libraries............................. 268
6. Library Demonstrations.................................. 270
7. School Library Resources................................ 272
8. Undergraduate Instructional Equipment................... 276
9. Elementary and Secondary Equipment and Minor Remodeling.. 278

G. Educational Technology Programs............................. 281

1. Educational Broadcasting Facilities..................... 282
2. Sesame Street and Electric Company...................... 285

H. Special Demonstration Programs.............................. 288

1. Right-to-Read... 289
2. Drug Abuse Education.................................... 293
3. Environmental Education................................. 295
4. Nutrition and Health.................................... 297
5. Dropout Prevention...................................... 298
6. General Program Dissemination, Office of Public Affairs.. 302

I. Indian Education Programs................................... 304

1. Revision of Impacted Areas as It Relates to Indian Children... 305
2. Special Programs and Projects to Improve Educational Opportunities for Indian Children.................... 307
3. Special Programs Relating to Adult Education for Indians. 309

Annual Evaluation Report on Progr[illegible]
Administered by the U.S. Office of Education
FY 1973

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Section 413 of the General Education Provisions Act requires that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare transmit to the appropriate legislative and appropriations committees of the Congress, "a report evaluating the results and effectiveness of programs and projects assisted thereunder during the preceding fiscal year...." The programs and projects refer to those for which the Commissioner of Education has responsibility for administration. This is the third year that a comprehensive report on all Office of Education programs is being submitted. It encompasses and supercedes individual reports submitted in prior years including those on ESEA Titles I, II, III, V, VII and Civil Rights.

This report is an update and extension of last year's report and incorporates the results of the evaluation studies completed during FY 73 (14 studies) as well as new information derived from program operations, data collections and monitoring activities. The report covers OE programs as of June 30, 1973. Program decisions, legislative and budget activities, and program information subsequent to June 30, 1973 are not reflected.

B. History of Evaluation in the Office of Education

Systematic efforts at evaluating Office of Education programs have had a comparatively brief history. Prior to FY 1970 this was due primarily to lack of funds and technically qualified evaluation staff. In FY 1968 and 1969, for example, only $1.25 million was appropriated for evaluating over $4 billion in Office of Education programs; and in prior years even smaller amounts were available. The FY 1970 appropriation of $9.5 million marked the first significant amount specifically made available for the purpose of planning and evaluating Federal education programs. The appropriation bill, however, was not enacted until late in the fiscal year (March 1970), and it required a "crash effort" to assemble qualified staff and initiate the first series of systematic evaluation projects in the final three months of the fiscal year.

In the three and a half years that have elapsed since that time, the Office of Education has attempted to expand and upgrade its evaluation capability. The evaluation function has been centralized in a staff office (Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation), a most technically competent and experienced staff of evaluators has been assembled, over a hundred evaluation and planning studies have been designed and initiated, a dissemination process for distributing the results of evaluation studies to the Congress, the Executive Office, and the education community has been implemented, and a mechanism to enable evaluation findings to influence the policy decision process has been developed.

The following table shows the funds available for educational planning and evaluation for the period FY 1968 - 1974:

TABLE I[4]

FY 1968	$ 1,250,000
1969	1,250,000
1970	9,512,000 [3]
1971	12,475,000 [1] [3]
1972	11,225,000 [1] [2]
1973	10,205,000 [1]
1974	5,200,000 [1]

[1] Includes funds for the Educational Policy Research Centers at Syracuse and Stanford Research Institute.

[2] Excludes $1,000,000 earmarked for NIE planning.

[3] Does not include $5,000,000 appropriated for grants to States for planning and evaluation under ESEA, Title V, Part C.

[4] Program funds authorized for evaluation of Follow Through, the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP), and the Emergency School Assistance Act (ESAA) are not included in the above appropriations, nor are program funds used by State and local education agencies on evaluations of ESEA, Titles I, III, VII and VIII.

C. Federal Role in Education

By law and tradition the Federal role in American education is a limited one. At all levels, American education is primarily a State and local enterprise. The single largest source of funding for public schools is from local property taxes, and the establishment of educational policies and the administration of the schools is for the most part under local authority. State roles vary as does the proportion of State funding of schools, (which has been steadily increasing over the last few years), but in general the State Education Agencies have been concerned with financing, maintaining minimum requirements for expenditures, teacher qualifications, curricula offerings, student attendance, facilities, etc. In recent years States have expanded their roles to include planning, evaluation, legislative initiatives, technical assistance to LEA's and similar activities. In terms of funding, the Federal contribution to American education is small. Overall, in FY 73, the Office of Education contributed 5.6% and the Federal government as a whole about 15.1% of the total national expenditures for education ($89.5 billion). The Federal contribution to elementary and secondary education was 10.1% and to post-secondary education 18.1%. The Office of Education's contribution was 5.3% to both areas.

Over the years educational legislation has been enacted and programs created in response to a variety of national interests, needs and opportunities as perceived by the Congress and various administrations. Although the approach has been piecemeal and directions have changed, the approximately 100 education programs or legislative titles have tended to focus on three basic objectives:

. To equalize educational opportunity for groups and individuals who are at a disadvantage educationally by reason of economic, racial, geographic, or physical and mental handicapping conditions.

. To improve the quality and relevance of American education primarily though research, development, experiementation, demonstration, dissemination and training activities.

. To provide limited general support to selected education functions and activities such as libraries, State education agencies, construction, developing institutions, vocational education, etc.

D. Overview of the Effectiveness of OE Programs

The previous reports included a broad assessment of how well the three major objectives were being furthered through the variety of programs devoted to them. Changes since the last year have not been so great as to modify the overall picture, and in general, it was concluded that:

. Although the largest Federal thrust has been the attempt to redress various inequalities in educational opportunity, none of the programs individually or all the programs collectively, have yet succeeded in achieving all of their objectives. Nevetheless, the programs in the aggregate seem to have made a substantial contribution to the goal of equalizing educational opportunity for all American citizens.

. The research, experimentation, demonstration, dissemination and training activities have not been regarded as highly successful overall despite the fact that a number of notable successes (e.g., development of individually prescribed instruction, the Multi-Level School, Computer Assisted Instruction, Sesame Street and the Electric Company, National Assessment, New Curricula in Physics, English and Math, etc.) have been achieved with individual projects. Acknowledgement of the many shortcomings in the Federal educational R&D effort over the years led to the establishment of the National Institute of Education (NIE) and the transfer of OE responsibility in this area to the NIE (Public Law 92-318, 92nd Congress - Education Amendments of 1972).

. The provision of selected general support has helped schools and colleges in such areas as impact aid, construction and equipment programs, basic grants to States for vocational and adult education, aid to land grant colleges, public library programs and the purchase of school and college library materials.

1. Evaluations of Elementary and Secondary Education Programs

Over the past few years, the primary objective for evaluation activities in elementary and secondary education has been simply to conduct studies of the impact of major Federal programs. Evaluations for most legislated programs have been initiated and substantial new findings are beginning to emerge. Most of the studies fall in one of two categories:

Studies assessing the effect of special programs for education of disadvantaged children (ESEA Title I, Title VII, Follow-Through, etc.), or

Studies assessing the impact of school desegregation programs (ESAP, ESAA, CR IV).

a) Assessing the effect of special programs for education of disadvantaged children.

Since the Federal government began in the 1960's to accept some responsibility for the plight of educationally disadvantaged children, many educational programs have been initiated at the Federal, State, and local levels. Most began without benefit of guidance from research on effective learning methods and have continued for some years without clear evidence as to their effectiveness or impact on children. One of the main purposes of evaluation in the area of elementary and secondary education is to provide such evidence both with respect to programs as a whole and with respect to individual State, school district, school or classroom approaches to education of disadvantaged children.

The major evaluations recently completed in this category include a study of the ESEA, Title I Migrant Program, A Process Evaluation of the

Bilingual Program, an Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP II), an Analysis of Reading and Mathematics Achievement Gains and Per-pupil Expenditures in California Title I Projects during FY 1972, and an Evaluation of the Follow-Through Program (interim findings of an on-going evaluation). For the most part, these studies were aimed at determining the effect of program activities on cognitive and affective changes in students or finding answers to such key questions as: Are some approaches working better than others? How well are programs operating? What program characteristics are associated with success or failure?

The key findings from these studies include:

. Migrant Study - Migrant students lag behind their contemporaries in reading and mathematics achievement with the greatest gaps occuring in grades 3 and 4 and persisting thereafter. Nevertheless migrant children had high academic and career expectations. These were not realistic in terms of their achievement and dropout patterns. Migrant parents expressed satisfaction with the school experiences of their children and thought that their children had been helped academically.

. Bilingual Study - The study indicated that although bilingual programs were beginning to take hold and proliferate in a substantial way in school systems, the shortage of bilingual teachers and applicable curriculum materials presented a serious drawback.

. ESAP II Study - Black male high school students gained in achievement through ESAP, although whites, elementary school blacks and female high school blacks did not gain. Yet the gains for black high school males are important because they normally have the

the lowest level of achievement.

- The study of Reading and Mathematics Achievement Gains and Per-pupil Expenditures in California Title I Programs

addressed the problem of "critical mass" (i.e., the proposition that there is a specific level above which expenditures for compensatory education appear to be effective and below which they are not effective). The study found no evidence of such a level.

- Follow Through is the closest approximation in education to

a large scale, planned experiment. Despite many problems, the program has developed several alternative compensatory education models, and the attendant national evaluation has reached the point where meaningful results are starting to become available. Analysis of the most recent data indicate that some of the ten models in the national evaluation seem to be effective in bringing about improvements in reading and mathematics achievement but that others are not. Some models also show up better than others on noncognitive measures though they are not necessarily the same as those that score high on achievement. The main purposes of the program--to develop alternative approaches to education of disadvantaged children and to identify the more effective approaches--are thus being achieved. Further data collection and analysis in FY 74 and beyond will amplify the preliminary results now available.

b) Assessing the impact of school desegregation programs.

A second major Federal concern in elementary and secondary education has been to support equal educational opportunity through programs designed to help achieve successful school desegregation. Beginning with the first Emergency School Aid Program (ESAP-I), evaluations of the major program components have been conducted each year. A completed evaluation of ESAP-II and the on-going ESAA evaluations were designed to measure the impact of the Federal programs on racial climate in the schools and the acquisition of basic skills by students. Findings so far indicate:

. ESAP caused gains in academic achievement for black male high school students. (Mentioned above).

. This achievement gain was attributable to the use of ESAP funds in ways that created effective changes in the way high schools handled racial issues.

. Human relations programs seem to have been effective in improving the attitudes toward integration of urban white students.

. Student achievement for both races depends less on the racial composition of the school than on the quality of race relations within the school.

. Desegregation places a great deal of strain on students of both races, but the school can ease this strain by having a staff that supports desegration, operating in a non-discriminatory way, and helping desegregation to proceed smoothly. The school environment--and especially the principal--appears to be able to change the way teachers behave toward black students even if teachers' personal feelings about race are not easily changed.

2. Evaluations of Programs for Education for the Handicapped

The programs authorized under the Education for the Handicapped Act may be grouped into three categories, indicating variations in strategies of support:

. Programs providing direct service to States. This includes the State Grant program, the Deaf-Blind Centers, the Regional Resource Centers, and the service functions performed by the Media Services and Captioned Films program (including the Information part of the Recruitment and Information activities).

. Programs which develop and demonstrate new technologies, materials, or models for serving the handicapped. This includes the Early Childhood program, the Specific Learning Disabilities program, the Innovation and Development program, and the development of new media and materials under the Media Services program.

. Special Education Manpower Development provides the support function of training teachers and other educational personnel to work with the handicapped.

In all three categories, the Federal role is principally a catalytic one, whereby OE provides "seed" money to States and other grantees in order to stimulate increases in both the quantity and quality of services provided by States. As a matter of policy, OE has not sought to provide direct service to all children not currently served by State and local programs (except for the Deaf-Blind/child, where because of the critical and costly nature of the handicap OE plays a principal role in the provision of direct services).

Formal evaluations of effectiveness have not been completed on most of the handicapped programs although several are in process. Information from program operations, however, provide the following data on program scope and the ability to serve the target population.

a) Programs providing direct service to States

. Analysis of the State Grant program indicates that the program in FY 73 has helped stimulate educational opportunities, supported by non-Federal funds for an additional 200,000 handicapped children in twenty-five States.

. Program information on the Deaf-Blind Centers indicates that they are reaching substantial numbers of deaf-blind children. In FY 73 services were provided to approximately 46% of an estimated target population of 5000 children. in FY 70 only 100 children received services.

. The Regional Resource Centers served approximately 40,000 handicapped children in FY 73 with comprehensive diagnostic, prescriptive, remedial and other supportive services. Studies indicate, however, that the Regional Resource Centers and Instructional Materials Centers need to be better coordinated for more efficient operations and better services.

b) Developmental and Demonstration Programs

. In FY 73, the Early Childhood program supported a variety of operational and outreach projects which provided direct services to over 4,500 children. More importantly, however, through replication of model projects and outreach activities, an additional 17,500 children were served, and training and other supportive services were provided to over 20,000 parents and education staff members.

. The Specific Learning Disabilities Program in FY 73 established model projects in 43 states with supportive technical and training assistance to help stimulate State and local provision of educational services.

. The Innovation and Development Program helped fund 68 projects in FY 73 to support research, demonstration, and development activities. Included were such projects as development of curriculum materials for mentally retarded children, post-secondary vocational training for hearing impaired youth, teacher training techniques and instructional materials using applied behavior modification techniques, etc.

c) Special Education Manpower Development Program

. During FY 73 this program provided direct financial assistance to over 19,000 "special ed" students. Studies of the program indicate that special education teacher production is just keeping even with the attrition in the field and the requirement to fill open vacancies (20,000 annually). The program is considered an important factor in qualifying students for jobs in the field.

3. Evaluation of Programs for Occupational and Adult Education

Evaluation activities in the Occupational and Adult Education area may be loosely grouped into three categories:

. Studies of programs that deal with occupational training activities and their effects on job placement, earnings and other indications of what happens to students after they complete the programs.

. Studies of programs and their effectiveness in dealing with special target groups such as the handicapped and the disadvantaged.

. Studies of programs that deal with resource development activities.

a) Programs that deal with occupational training activities

Included in this category are: Vocational and Technical Education Basic Grants to States, Consumer and Homemaking Education, Cooperative Education and Manpower Development and Training Programs. A number of studies in this area have indicated the following:

The National Longitudinal surveys by the Department of Labor provides some reliable data about vocational education. They confirm that graduates of vocational programs do have an advantage in obtaining jobs and suggests that the influence of vocational education on earnings is more closely related to changes in labor market conditions than had been thought to be the case before.

Another study, a case study of three cities, shows that high school graduates from vocational curriculum experienced 5 to 10 percentage points more time employed during the six-year follow-up period than was the case with the graduates of the academic curriculum who did not attend college.

Data from a study of duplication, gaps and coordination of publicly funded skill training programs in 20 cities on more than 390,000 enrollees indicate that 65% were enrolled in secondary vocational education programs. Of the remaining 35 percent who participated in Federal manpower programs, over two-thirds were enrolled in occupational programs in post-secondary institutions. Analysis of enrollee characteristics data indicate that vocational programs and manpower programs serve different populations. Most manpower enrollees are those over 18 years of age with 6th to 10th grade level of educational attainment. Such enrollees rarely find a place in post-secondary institutions which usually have some form of academic restriction even where there is a policy of open admissions. Several programs, notably Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, offer skill training to the high school age group normally served by secondary vocational programs. Accounting for only two-percent of the secondary school-aged students enrolled in skill training, these programs are primarily for dropouts. They offer the same occupational skills which are available in the better public secondary programs, although the manpower programs offer considerably more service in terms of guidance, remedial education, placement and job coaching.

The objectives of a study of school supervised work-education programs were to examine the different configurations of work education programs which currently exist in the United States, to determine the degree that different types of programs are meeting their intended objectives, and to suggest ways in which different types of programs might be modified or expanded. According to this study's findings, specific occupational training programs (cooperative education programs for the most part) appear to be generating the most enthusiasm among students, employers, and school officials because they are meeting the expressed needs and objectives of all three groups. Students feel that cooperative education programs are providing them with valuable job training. Employers feel that they are getting their money's worth out of their student workers and are contributing to their occupation. School administrators and teachers are satisfied with the learnings and job placements after the training period resulting from these programs.

Dropout prevention programs are designed primarily as financial assistance programs to keep students in school. While many have additional goals such as improving disadvantaged youngster's attitudes toward school and work, practically none of these programs attempt to offer students related classwork or intensive vocational training. It was found that they are more likely than any other type of program to offer students jobs paying at least the minimum wage, but they were second (by a slight amount) to specific occupation training programs as most likely to improve student's attitudes toward school.

A comparative study of 51 proprietary and 14 non-proprietary schools in four cities examined student outcomes in four occupational areas; office, health, computer and technical occupations. About 7,000 students and 5,200 alumni were queried. Findings indicate that more than half found training-related jobs. However, less than 20% of the proprietary alumni and only 13% of the non-proprietary alumni obtained jobs through school placement service, a surprising result especially for proprietary schools, since virtually all offer placement assistance. Most graduates indicated satisfaction with their current job status. Of those alumni currently employed, about 34% of the proprietary and 12% of the non-proprietary group felt that the training was definitely not worth the money. Analysis of costs indicate that the investment in vocational training was considered worthwhile for all occupational groups except the computer trainees in proprietary schools. Non-proprietary school graduates gain more in salary than proprietary school graduates as a result of training. Proprietary and non-proprietary schools differ substantially in their operations and program offerings; however, the students enrolled in both types of schools are very similar in terms of characteristics. Most are young high school graduates enrolled in full-time programs with a goal of obtaining full-time jobs. A sizeable proportion of the students (30% proprietary and; 42% non-proprietary) belong to minority ethnic groups. Cities surveyed include: Chicago, Illinois; Atlanta, Georgia; San Francisco, California; and Rochester, New York.

b) Programs that deal with special target groups such as the handicapped and disadvantaged

Included in this category are: Programs for Students with Special Needs, Work Study Programs and Adult Basic Education Grants to States. A number of studies in this area have highlighted the following:

. Findings from a study of the impact of the 1968 Vocational Education Act amendments have indicated that for disadvantaged and handicapped populations, there appears to be no relationship between Federal set-aside funds and the investment of State/local funds for these target groups. Data indicates that these were low priority areas in most States and some did not fully expand the Federal set-asides for these groups.

. A study of practical career guidance, counseling, and placement for the non-college-bound student reviewed data concerned with the practical career guidance and counseling for noncollege-bound students.

The report confirmed the widespread impression that women, minority, and disadvantaged students have not been provided sufficient occupational information and assistance in relating their abilities and interests to career options. Furthermore, the overall conclusion drawn was that the functions of guidance and counseling personnel generally have not been aligned to provide practical career guidance for noncollege-bound students despite national priorities and allocations of funds.

. A longitudinal study of the Adult Basic Education Program found that ABE students achieved significant gains in reading mathematics and writing ability. The percentage of students employed increased and the percentage on welfare decreased. Students achieved substantial increases in earnings and many felt that the program had helped in obtaining the increases and had helped them in their jobs. Most liked ABE classes better than their previous schooling.

. A study of adult vocational education programs in three cities examined the extent to which the programs are meeting the needs of the poorer inner city resident. Programs for adults primarily were designed to permit employed persons to sharpen present skills, develop additional skills or pursue an avocational outlet.

Local programs lack operational services such as planning, counseling and guidance. Courses are provided primarily within constraints of the traditional hour and semester structure.

c) Programs that deal with resource development activities

Included in this category are: Vocational and Technical Education: Research and Training, Exemplary Programs, Adult Basic Education: Special Projects and Teacher Training. Most of these programs have been in a state of change and assessments of effectiveness are planned but not yet completed.

d) Highlights

In summary, the following findings have emerged:

. Findings on occupational training programs - Vocational or skills training programs have been shown to be effective by several studies. Evidence of this range from expressed satisfaction with the training by students, teachers and employers, to more employed time and increased earnings. On the other hand, differences (particularly employed time and earnings) are modest and entry into the labor market is more likely to be a function of changes in the economic health of the labor market.

As regards coverage, there is minimal overlap among various Federally funded programs, e.g., programs supported by the Vocational Education Act (VEA) and by the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA). Where there is apparent overlap, e.g., the VEA Work Study program, Job Corps, and Neighborhood Yough Corps, the overlap is in terms of attempting to reach the same target group (low income, high dropout potential youth) but with a variety of approaches. Even so, the programs taken together do not reach all members of the target group (see next section).

. Programs for special target groups - The 1968 Amendments of VEA expressed a mandate to serve certain target groups by creating three set-asides for disadvantaged, handicapped and postsecondary programs. The evidence for a change in priorities is rather discouraging. It appears now that a change in State and local priorities has not been achieved. That is, where State and local agencies have a high priority (postsecondary programs), it appears that Federal funds are utilized effectively and are overmatched by State and local funds. However, where State and local priorities were low (disadvantaged and handicapped), increasing programming for these groups takes place primarily because of Federal requirements with little evidence of matching by State and local funds. However, these findings must be considered indicative rather than definitive because they are derived from data in only ten States.

A few studies have focused on the quality of services delivered to special target groups. These studies indicate that the services are not of high quality and that considerable effort at improving the services is needed. For example, guidance and counseling services have been shown to be inadequate for women, minorities and disadvantaged persons at both the secondary and adult levels.

4. Evaluation of Post-Secondary Education Programs

For over a decade the Federal government has increasingly tried to broaden opportunities in higher education for economically disadvantaged students. In recent years, it has extended financial and other types of assistance to students attending proprietary post-secondary institutions.

The Federal objectives for such assistance have been:

- To remove financial barriers to access to some form of post-secondary education for all individuals appropriate to their capabilities and desires.
- To strengthen the motivation to attend a post-secondary institution among disadvantaged students and to provide supportive services after they have entered the institution.
- To help build institutional capability in terms of facilities and improved quality of staff and instructional offerings in support of the above objectives.

These objectives form a "continuum" of assistance: contact with the disadvantaged student while he is still in high school and attempting to interest him in college attendance; providing a financial aid package for the student at the college in which he enrolls; and, attempting to increase his chances of remaining in college through provision of special academic and counseling services.

a) Removal of financial barriers to access to post-secondary education

While rates of attendance by low-income students have increased greatly since 1965, it is not yet possible to statistically prove the specific inducement effects of Federal financial aid. Without such aid, however, it is quite unlikely that many low-income students would have been able to attend post-secondary institutions. In FY 1973, for example almost 2.4 million students received financial assistance from the Office of Education in the form of grants, loans and work-study assistance. These were principally students from families with incomes less than $7,500 annually.

The programs furthering this objective include: the Basic Opportunity Grant Program (BOG's), Guaranteed Loan Program (GLP), National Direct Student Loan Program (NDSL), College Work-Study Program (CWSP) and the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program (SEOG). Depending on individual circumstances, Federal student aid to low-income students is generally provided in a "package" consisting in part of a direct grant, (BOG, SEOG), a loan and (NDSL, GLP) possibly a work-study grant (CWSP).

Success of these programs can best be judged in terms of increases in the number of low-income students attending post-secondary institutions. Studies indicate that although low-income students are not yet attending post-secondary schools in the same proportion as their numbers in the general population, nevetheless their rates of attendance are increasing. That student aid programs appear to be reaching their target populations is indicated by the fact that in FY 73 students with family incomes below $7.500 participate in the aid programs as follows:

College Work Study	71.5%
Guaranteed Student Loan	36.0%
National Direct Student Loan	61.9%
Supplemental E.O.G.	87.9%

b) Strengthening the motivation to attend a post-secondary institution among disadvantaged students

Furthering the objective of motivating disadvantaged students to attend college also requires use of non-financial inducements to enrollment. Unlike financial aid, which require very large amounts of capital and commonality of eligibility rules, programs of motivational inducements can be carried out by States and by educational institutions themselves provided that certain models are available for replication. Presently, the Federal government is administering the Upward Bound and Talent Search Programs and funding those recruitment projects which indicate the greatest promise of demonstrating both efficiency and effectiveness.

An early study of the Upward Bound Program by the Office of Economic Opportunity (the 1970 Greenleigh Study) found that the program was succeeding in enrolling disadvantaged students in college (students who probably would not have enrolled otherwise) and that their retention rate was similar to that of more affluent students. However, a later 1973 study by the General Accounting Office found that these early program successes apparently did not persist. The GAO study indicated that although the program still enrolled a majority of its participants in college, the percentage was somewhat lower than in the early years and the attrition rate was higher (11% more than the national norm for all college enrollees).

The objective of motivating disadvantaged students to enroll in college cannot be fulfilled adequately if disadvantaged students drop-out or fail prior to completion of their programs. Most disadvantaged students are less well-prepared for college work than those from more affluent families. Thus, special academic and counseling services are required to reduce the normal high attrition rate of low-income students.

Although a formal evaluation of the Special Services Program has not been completed, operational data indicate that over 63,000 students participated in the program in FY 73 and that chances for academic success among participating students are improved when compared with other groups of diwadvantaged students. In the previous years, for example, approximately 10,000 participating students were able to move out of the program into regular academic channels.

c) Building institutional capability

The main purpose of most Federal activity in the area of institutional support is to assist those institutions considered out of the mainstream (or underdeveloped) and serving large numbers of educationally and economically disadvantaged. These institutions are assisted under Title III of the Higher Education Act, the Strengthening Developing Institutions Program. An evaluation of this program indicates mixed success. Some participating institutions have been helped by the program, but other non-program factors play an important part, such as the quality of the institutions' leadership, the continuity of funding and the stage of development of the institution.

Among other programs supporting institutional capability building are:

- NDEA Fellowship Program - This program has been largely successful in helping increase the supply of well-trained college teachers and helps strengthen doctoral programs. The program focus has been changed to assist returning veterans and is too new for its results to be assessed.

- EPDA, Part E Fellowships and Institutes Programs - These programs are designed to increase the supply of well prepared teachers, administrators and specialists in areas of critical need for colleges and universities. Studies indicate that the Fellowship Program was effective in influencing able students to prepare for careers in higher education and the Institutes Program provided a focus on high priority training needs of higher education professionals.

E. Highlights of New Findings

As indicated, a number of evaluation studies were completed during the year which provided new information about the impact on effectiveness of the programs studied. Following are the highlights of these studies:

1. Impact Evaluation Report, Use of Incentives in Education Project

   The purpose of this study was to examine the use of incentives as a technique for raising student achievement as an outgrowth of interest generated by performance contracting experiments during the 1970 - 71 school year. This pilot project offered incentives to teachers at four sites across the country, and to parents at two of these sites, for increases in student achievement in reading and arithmetic above a predicted mean classroom level. The findings show that students made gains when both the teachers and parents were paid incentives, but much smaller gains were recorde when only the teachers were paid incentives. The report recommends that the "teacher-parent" model be further studied, but that the "teacher-only" model not be studied.

2. Evaluation of the Career Opportunities Program.

   The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the Career Opportunities Program on the training of participants, students, and the communities involved. The report concluded that COP had been successful in enabling many disadvantaged adults to enter the educational profession and in introducing paraprofessionals to many classrooms. Changes were also reported in linkages with community groups and in course content of teacher training institutio

There was no evidence that achievement of students in the classrooms had been affected by the program.

3. An Analysis of the Relationship Between Reading and Mathematics Achievement Gains and Per-pupil Expenditures in California Title I Projects Fiscal Year 1972. The purpose of this study was to examine the issue of "critical mass" (the notion that supplementary education expenditures above a certain level would produce achievement gains among disadvantaged students, but expenditures below that level would not produce gains). This study examined the relationship between costs and benefits in Title I projects in California during FY 1972. The study produced no results in support of the critical mass theory and only mixed evidence of a weak relationship between expenditures and achievement gains.
4. An Evaluation of Federal Programs to Increase the Pool of Special Education Teachers. The purpose of this study was to examine a variety of Federal efforts aimed at increasing the number of special education teachers. It concluded that training support does not necessarily lead an individual into training, but does increase the likelihood that he will complete training and enter the field. The study also found that the supply of special education teachers is beginning to meet the demand (where demand is defined as existence of funded positions). Some recommendations of the report are: a) make available more funds to train teachers for certain categories of handicaps; b) increase the representation of minority groups in the teaching pool; and c) upgrade the skills of practicing teachers.

5. The 1971-72 Vocational Impact Project. The purpose of this study was to examine various Federal programs and policies to see what steps had been taken in vocational education to aid the economically disadvantaged and the handicapped. The report concluded that Federa funds and regulations may influence the helping of these target groups, but the Federal government's support is too small a share of the total vocational education dollar to be the primary agent for bringing this about.
6. MDTA Basic Education Study. The purpose of this study was to assess the effect of the program on reading, computational and related skills of trainees enrolled in MDTA occupational projects. The findings indicated that MDTA trainees start at an average deficiency of 3.2 grades below (4.0 grades below for blacks) the highest school grade as reported as completed by the trainee. Post analysis indicated that Spanish-surname trainees make good reading gains, but reading problems for blacks are not adequately compensated. The report recommends that the MDTA staffs have more in-service training.
7. A Comparative Study of Proprietary and Non-Proprietary Vocational Training Programs. The purpose of this study was to compare the effectiveness of vocational training programs between proprietary and non-proprietary schools. The study focused on four vocational areas (computer, business, health, technical) in a sample of four major cities. Data were collected from institutional and program directors, students, and alumni. The report's principal findings were: 1) greater economic gains from training were achieved by

non-proprietary school graduates than by proprietary school graduates, and 2) accredited schools and chain schools surveyed were no more effective in placing graduates than unaccredited and non-chain schools.

8. The Public Library and Federal Policy (Phase I). The purpose of this study was to analyze the role of public libraries in today's society. The report indicated that libraries are attempting to change to meet the needs of the public. Recent efforts have been made to provide services to rural populations and the disadvantaged; to make library staff members more responsive to the communities they serve; and to develop library systems that can provide more efficient and equitable services. However, the libraries are experiencing problems in the areas of finance, organization, personnel, and technology. The report recommended the following postures in regard to Federal policy of library assistance: 1) Aid in planning for national services; 2) promote increased system organization among all libraries; and 3) emphasize improvement of public library services for the socioeconomically disadvantaged.

9. The 1971-72 Nationwide Installation of the Multiunit/IGE Model for Elementary Schools. The purpose of this study was to examine the implementation process of the Multi-unit/IGE program in 13 States during the 1971-72 school year. The project resulted in the publication of a two-volume report that provides a process evaluation of the first-year installation of the Multiunit School and Individual Guided Instruction patterns. The study findings

indicate that the efforts to implement MUSE/IGE on a nationwide scale have had varying degrees of success. Recommendations for policy improvements include: 1) Increasing the amount of training and guidance for school personnel; 2) making time-sequenced implementation more clear, and 3) creating a flexible package of installation procedures.

10. Development of a System for Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Educational Regional Labs and R&D Centers. The purpose of this project was to design and pilot test a system for the evaluation of the products of educational research and development centers and laboratories. As a result of the experience gained from the pilot test of the evaluation system, the report made numerous recommendations concerning product reporting procedures, criteria, and instrumentation. The report also contains cost projections for operation of the system in alternative configurations.

11. Analysis of Finances and Enrollment of Selected Institutions of Higher Education. This was Phase II of the "Cost of College" study. Its purpose was to analyze the causes of the "financial crisis" claimed by institutions of higher education with a special focus on their use of resources. The report did not find higher education facing the bleak future that others had predicted. Of those colleges in financial trouble, there were indications that the difficulties involve expenditures rather than revenues. The study suggested the following management improvements: a) Non-proliferation of courses, maintenance of teaching loads and section sizes, and containment of salary

increases; b) development of management information, and c) program budgeting. With respect to Federal policy, the report recommended more selective and non-uniform aid to meet the demands of the different constituencies of the institutions.

12. Study of the EPDA, Part V-E, Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel. The purpose of this study was to identify the training needs of higher education personnel and to determine how well the program was meeting these needs. The findings show administrators most often indicated need for training in 1) relating to people of other races and cultures and 2) developing goals and operating programs. The survey also indicated that the greatest personnel needs currently existing among colleges are in the areas of admissions-recruiting and personal counseling. Administrators favored hiring qualified personnel rather than training unskilled persons. Most all of the institutions indicated that lack of money was the greatest obstacle to filling personnel needs.

13. Practical Career Guidance, Counseling, and Placement for the Non-College-Bound Student. The purpose of this study was to review the effect of career guidance and counseling programs for noncollege-bound students. The findings indicate that women, minority, and disadvantaged students have not obtained sufficient occupational information and assistance in relating their abilities and interests to career options. Furthermore, the functions of guidance and counseling personnel generally have not been designed to provide practical career guidance for noncollege-bound students despite national priorities and allocations of funds. Recognizing

the need for realignment of the counseling services for the noncollege-bound, the report recommends that 1) guidance and counseling experts provide more specific information and 2) realignment be based on a planning model that include assessment of the priority of target groups, selection of appropriate strategies, and evaluation of efforts.

14. Evaluation of ESAP-I Community Group Program. The purpose of this program was to evaluate the ESAP Community Group programs designed to promote community participation in school desegregation. The study was based primarily on data gathered from interviews with CG staff members, school administrators, board of education members, students, and influential members of the community. Community acceptance of the CG projects, for the most part, was favorable. Seventy-five percent of the 585 persons interviewed felt the community group program had contributed positively to the local school desegregation process. A major weakness of the program appeared to be the lack of cooperation and coordination between the CGs and the LEAs. The principle recommendation evolving from this evaluation is that some mechanism must be established to ensure mutual LEA and ESAP-CG coordination and cooperation in support of desegregation. This mechanism must work at all levels, in all matters and decisions, and in all parts of the country if the imense potential gains of the ESAP-CG is to be fully realized.

F. Studies in Process

As indicated, the evaluation of Federal education programs is now a continuous activity. The following brief descriptions highlight those studies that were in process during FY 1973:

1. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Programs for Migratory Children. The Education Amendments Act of 1972 directed the Commissioner to conduct a study of the effects of Title I on the education of children of migratory agricultural workers. The study is reporting on the effectiveness of individual programs and projects with respect to migrant children. It is also evaluating the State administration of these programs and will make recommendations for the improvement of such programs.
   Contractor: Exotech Systems, Inc., Falls Church, Virginia.
2. A Process Evaluation of the Bilingual Program. This study is collecting data on the management of the Bilingual program. Information is being gathered on the characteristics of the various kinds of projects, the participants, teachers, etc.
   Contractor: Development Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.
3. A Study of Change Agent Programs. This study is collecting data on various programs designed to introduce innovative practices to school systems (examples: Right-to-Read, Titles III and VII of ESEA). This study will attempt to determine the best methods of demonstration and replication of the innovative practices that are found to be most effective.
   Contractor: Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California.
4. A Large Scale Evaluation of Compensatory Reading and Reading Related Efforts in the Elementary Grades. This study is assessing the effectiveness of compensatory reading programs under Title I funding available to economically disadvantaged

students. The impact on student's reading skill attainment and different aspects of the program's efforts are of high concern.
Contractor: Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

5. Development of Project Information Packages for Effective Approaches in Compensatory Education. The New Incentives grant program of ESEA, Title I provides financial incentives to promote the proliferation and use of successful approaches to compensatory education for disadvantaged children. This study is attempting to develop a number of validated and well-packaged models of successful compensatory education practices for disseminations.
Contractor: RMC Research Corporation, Bethesda, Maryland.

6. Identification of Exemplary Desegregated Schools and Evaluation of the Determinants of Success. The purpose of this study is to review available research on effective programs to implement school desegregation. It is anticipated that this in-depth examination of exemplary desegregated schools will identify the programs, policies, and practices that contribute most to the success of these schools.
Contractor: Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

7. Evaluation of the ESAA General LEA Program. The objectives of this study are: 1) to determine the overall effectiveness of the program in achieving goals and objectives specified in the Emergency School Aid Act; 2) to determine the relative effectiveness of different activities funded under the General LEA Grants Program, and 3) to examine the conditions under which activities are effective.
Contractor: System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California.

8. A Longitudinal Evaluation of the ESAA Pilot Program. This is a detailed study to evaluate the national impact of the ESAA Pilot Program on a nationally representative sample of minority students. Other objectives of the study include: 1) evaluating the cumulative effects of different types of treatments, under various exposure durations; 2) determining the differential effectiveness of local programs; and 3) comparing successful local projects to similar but unsuccessful projects in effort to determine the difference between success and failure. Contractor: System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California.

9. Evaluation of an Aid-to-States Program for Education of Handicapped Children. This study is assessing the impact of State grant funds in terms of 1) the extent to which demonstration projects are replicated, and 2) the role of Federal funds in stimulating more programs, a greater expansion of services, and increased State and local funding. Contractor: Exotech Systems, Inc., Falls Church, Virginia.

10. An Evaluation of Educational Programs in State-Operated and State-Supported Schools for Handicapped Children. This study is assessing the impact of support provided under the provisions of ESEA Title I, as amended by P.L. 89-313. Impact is being measured in terms of 1) increased resources available to the handicapped children of these institutions, 2) the degree of increased quality of education programs, 3) the degree to which

children show improved outcomes, and 4) the degree to which Federal funds have a stimulator effect on State funding.

Contractor: Exotech Systems, Inc., Washington, D.C.

11. Study of Programs Serving the Profoundly Handicapped. Severely handicapped children, including those with multiple handicaps, normally can only obtain educational services within the context of costly residential care institutions. Because of inadequate resources, many are unable to obtain any help. The objectives of this study are 1) to determine the numbers and types of severely handicapped children receiving services, 2) to identify the types of services now received, and 3) to determine the type and quantity of services now received to meet the need.

Contractor: ABT Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

12. Study of the Impact of Federal Programs on Poor, Handicapped Children. The problems faced by children who are both poor and handicapped make them a high priority target group for education services, but little or no data are available on this population. With the current thrust to provide services to handicapped children the objectives of this study are: 1) to determine the number of poor handicapped children receiving services, 2) to develop estimates of the number needing but not receiving services, 3) to determine what services are being provided, and 4) to assess if the services received are adequate for the special needs of these children.

Contractor: Exotech Systems, Inc., Falls Church, Virginia.

13. Vocational Education for the Handicapped. The Vocational Education Act as amended earmarks ten percent of the State grant money for programs providing vocational education to the handicapped. This study is identifying the methods by which States allocate these funds. In addition, the study will attempt to determine the impact of such funds.
Contractor: Olympus Research Corporation, Salt Lake City, Utah.

14. Evaluation of Vocational Exemplary Programs. This study is assessing the impact of vocational exemplary programs as vehicles to bring about educational change. An effort is being made to determine the extent to which research and development results are disseminated. The study also aims to assess the programs' impact on student attitudes, behavior, and placement.

15. Analysis of Base Year Data of the Vocational Impact Project. This study which is part of a national longitudinal study of high school seniors is aimed at assessing what is currently known about program impact and how well the State grant mechanism functions to implement the priorities of the 1968 Amendments. The study also is examining program gaps and duplications as a means to better coordination. A national survey under NCES responsibility is also under way to provide a quantitative description of vocational students, outcomes and services.
Contractor: Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

16. Longitudinal Evaluation of the Adult Basic Education Program. This study provides information on the relationship between past program performance and the kinds of experiences the ABE enrollee receives. It is also assesses the State grant mechanism to examine the extent to which the States serve adults in various demographic areas and the extent to which results of innovative projects have been incorporated into regular ABE classes.

    Contractor: System Development Corporation, Falls Church, Virginia.

17. Assessment of School-Supervised Work-Education Programs. The objectives of this study are: 1) to analyze and compare administrative and organizational designs of programs which have work experience components; 2) to examine the purposes and subpurposes of various work-education programs in order to determine similarities and unique differences; 3) to identify, describe, and rank experiences and services present in successful work-education programs, and 4) to identify and interpret existing constraints or limitations in carrying out work-education programs and to determine under what conditions work-education programs may be expanded.

    Contractor: System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California.

18. An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of MDTA Institutional Training Programs for Women. This study is aimed at assessing the effectiveness of MDTA training and services in preparing women for entry into the labor market. Measures of effectiveness include: 1) pre-and post-training earnings; 2) employment stability,

and 3) labor force participation. The study will examine the efforts being made to increase opportunities for women and will identify the inhibiting factors.

Contractor: Mark Battle Associates, Washington, D.C.

19. Project Metro:Effectiveness Data for Major City Secondary Education Systems. Project Metro was designed to examine vocational education practices and outcomes in twenty-two large cities. This report will present and discuss the survey findings for the Class of 1970 academic and general program graduates. The survey findings will be presented in terms of such independent variables as school district population, individual cities, type of curriculum, race and sex.

    Contractor: Educational Systems Research Institute, Inc.

20. Design of Evaluation Plan for the Right-to-Read Community-Based Project. No major study has been undertaken to assess the impact of the great variety of the community-based Right-to-Read projects. Such projects represent a major OE priority to reduce functional illiteracy. The purpose of this study is to develop a design of an impact evaluation plan for such projects.

    Contractor: Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation, Washington, D.C.

21. Longitudinal Impact Study of the Sixth Cycle Teacher Corps Program. This is a study of the Teacher Corps program to identify both the overall and differential impacts of the program on institutional change,

trainee development and classroom student performance. The study is based on a sample of all sixth cycle programs and is aimed at providing useful information on program outcomes and operations for program decision-makers.

Contractor: Contemporary Research, Inc. and System Development Corporation, Los Angeles, California.

22. Educational Telecommunications Planning System. This study is collecting and analyzing data on new and emerging telecommunication technology. The study is aimed at developing a set of recommendations regarding the role, shape, and direction of the Educational Broadcast Facilities Program.

    Contractor: Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio.

23. Evaluation of the Developmental Phase of the Rocky Mountain Satellite Project. This study is aimed at development of an evaluation model to be integrated into the planning process for the Rocky Mountain Federation project for wide-scale demonstration of selected technology-based learning systems. The effort will provide a detailed blueprint for ongoing formative evaluation as a major component of the demonstration project.

    Contractor: Stanford University, Denver Field Office.

24. Evaluation of the Library Service and Construction Act (Service to Special Clientele Groups). This is a major study assessing how well Titles I and II of the Library Services and Construction Act are meeting the public library needs of special clientele groups -- disadvantaged, ethnic minorities, handicapped and institutionalized persons. The project is surveying all

State Library Agencies, all known on-going projects directed toward these groups, and discontinued projects.

Contractor: System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California.

25. A Study of Upward Bound and Talent Search. This study is examining to what extent students effectively utilize information provided by these two programs which are targeted at aiding the disadvantaged to obtain a post-secondary education. Some attention is also being given to program methods and administration in order to determine what improvements can be made.

Contractor: Research Triangle Institute.

26. Survey of Borrowers and Lenders in the Federal Insured Student Loan Program. This study is collecting data on defaults in student loans in an effort to construct a default estimating model. The model will be integrated with an existing higher education enrollment projection model.

Contractor: Research Management Corporation.

27. A Comprehensive Study of the National Defense Student Loan Program. The purpose of this study is to determine the role the NDSL program plays in the total student aid package at colleges and universities across the nation. Data on the administration of the NDSL program is also being collected and examined.

Contractor: Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

28. A Comprehensive Study of the College Work-Study Program. This study is providing detailed information on the participants of the College Work-Study Program and the effectiveness of the program. The study has been all but completed with the final report remaining to be approved. One of the major conclusions of the study is that CWS is achieving its primary goal of helping students from low-income families to meet their post-secondary educational costs.

Contractor: Columbia University, New York, New York.

29. Survey of Special Services Program in Higher Education for Disadvantaged Students. This project is collecting data on the number of disadvantaged students now in higher education and the degree to which they are being served by Federal or other special programs. The study is assessing the effectiveness of such programs in retention of disadvantaged students in college and identifying the characteristics of particularly successful programs.

Contractor: Educational Testing Service, Durham, North Carolina.

30. A Study of the Developing Institutions Program. The purpose of this study is to assess the impact of the Developing Institutions Program under Title III of the Higher Education Act. The study is documenting the changes at the developing institutions funded between 1965 and 1971. The institutions that have done well are being compared with those that have not fared so well in an effort to discover the factors involved in successful programs.

Contractor: The University of California, Berkeley, California.

31. Higher Education Facilities Study. This is a study to determine realistic future academic facilities needs. Since reliable estimates of future enrollment up to 1984 already exist, the greatest expertise is required in developing reliable planning factors. Some consideration is also being given to the impact of alternative financing methods.

Contractor: Joseph Froomkin, Inc.

32. Private Accrediting and Public Funding. The purpose of this study is to analyze and critically evaluate the present procedures and methods for determining institutional eligibility for Federal financial assistance. Special attention is being given to the impact and implications of reliance upon accreditation.

Contractor: Brookings Institution

33. Post-Secondary Education National Planning Model. The purpose of this study is to identify criteria for the Office of Education to use in assessing the impact of its post-secondary programs on institutions and students and providing guidance for future allocation of Federal funds.

Contractor: The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Western International Commission for Higher Education.

34. Longitudinal Study of Demonstration Programs. This is a detailed study of the effects of large scale, intensive innovative efforts on the achievement and motivational levels of the same students over a three year period. Most programs were initially supported by Title III, ESEA, and involve some 21,000 students in 15 school districts.

Contractor: American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California.

35. Study of Alternative Models of a Guaranteed Student Loan Program

This study is formulating several alternatives to the present Guaranteed Student Loan Program (GSLP). The GSLP has come under criticism with regard to the nature of the repayment burden on borrowers (short term fixed amounts). The alternatives include a variety of flexible repayment terms and require estimates of costs and benefits to borrowers, lenders and Federal and State agencies.

Contractor: Systems Group, Inc., Washington, D. C.

36. Study of ESEA, Title I Formula Allocation

This study by the National Bureau of Standards was completed in March 1973 and a report submitted to Congress. It analyzes the allocation of Title I funds, the impact of use of FY 70 census data on the allocation of funds and analyzes a number of alternative formulas for allocating these funds. The study is being continued at the request of Congress to permit analysis of the effects of additional alternative allocation formulas.

DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTIVENESS INFORMATION ON INDIVIDUAL USOE ADMINISTERED PROGRAMS

The following section contains descriptions of each of the programs administered by the Office of Education. Included in the description of each program is its legislative authorization, its funding history, its purpose and operational approach, its scope, information about its effectiveness, current or planned evaluation studies and sources of evaluation data.

Since not all programs have yet been the subject of formal evaluations, effectiveness information has varying degrees of "hardness." The best effectiveness data, of course, results from completed formal evaluation studies. Where these are not available, program operating data, audit reports, project director evaluations and reports and similar data are presented. The sources of these data are varied and represent the efforts of many units within the Office of Education as well as some organizations outside of OE. These include evaluation studies by OPBE and various contractors, data compiled by NCES, data from program managers, data from HEW Audit Agency, GAO reports, data from State and local directors, etc. Where possible, the data sources are identified. In some cases, such as a financial support-type program or a newly funded program little can be said about effectiveness. Where applicable, this is indicated.

A. Elementary and Secondary Education Programs

1. Education of Disadvantaged Children
2. Supplementary Educational Centers and Services
3. Strengthening State Departments of Education
4. Bilingual Education
5. Follow Through
6. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Maintenance and Operation
7. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Construction
8. Emergency School Assistance
9. Training and Advisory Services, Title IV, CRA

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Education of Disadvantaged Children

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended	June 30, 1974

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	$1,192,581,000	$ 959,000,000
	1967	1,430,764,000	1,053,410,000
	1968	1,902,136,000	1,191,000,000
	1969	2,184,436,000	1,123,127,000
	1970	2,523,227,000	1,339,050,900
	1971	3,457,408,000	1,500,000,000
	1972	4,138,378,000	1,597,500,000
	1973	5,097,028,477	1,585,185,000
	1974	4,182,509,627*	1,719,500,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

Section 101 of P. L. 89-10, as amended through 90th Congress, 1st session states:

> In recognition of the specific educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local education agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this part) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contributes particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Administrative responsibilities for Title I are shared by the U. S. Commissio of Education, State education agencies (SEAs), and local education agencies (LEAs). USOE (1) determine the entitlements of counties and of State education agencies, (2) rateably reduces authorizations on the basis of Congressio appropriations, (3) distributes available funds to SEAs, (4) develops and

*subject to changes based on recalculation.

disseminates regulations, guidelines, and other materials related to administration of Title I, (5) provides monitoring and technical assistance to SEAs (6) compiles fiscal, statistical, and evaluation data, (7) evaluates the results and effectiveness of the program, and (8) receives assurances from SEAs that programs will be administered in accordance with the law and the regulations.

Participating SEAs must assure USOE that they will administer the program in their States and submit evaluation and fiscal reports as provided in the law and regulations. Administrative functions of SEAs include (1) approval or disapproval of proposed LEA projects, (2) suballocation of county aggregate grants to eligible LEAs, (3) provision of technical assistance to LEAs (4) maintenance of fiscal records, and (5) preparation of fiscal and evaluation reports for USOE.

In developing, proposing, implementing, and evaluating local projects LEAs are required to identify areas impacted with high concentrations of children from low-income families, assess the special needs of children in those areas, and design projects that match available resources to identified needs. In addition to these activities, LEAs must keep adequate fiscal records and provide SEAs with annual fiscal and evaluation reports.

Title I enabling legislation and USOE regulations instituted one of the largest Federal-State-local education partnerships in the history of United States education. The legislation authorizes Federal financing of thousands of separate, autonomous, local programs operated and administered by local school boards and approved by the State. USOE's primary role is to administer the program without exercising direction, supervision or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration or personnel of any educational institution, school, or school system. The intent of the law is to let local educational agencies--the agencies that are most acutely aware of the unique needs of local educationally deprived children--design and implement projects that will match available resources to local needs.

USOE's strategy for administration and operation of Title I at the State level has been to monitor those activities and provide technical assistance to the States as required. Similarly, monitoring and technical assistance activities are the responsibility of SEAs and are meant to insure LEA compliance with the letter and intent of Title I regulations. USOE's monitoring and technical assistance activities are a major component of the effort to improve ESEA Title I program operations at the State and local levels.

Improvement of local project impact on participating students is the goal of two additional strategies, namely, SEA project development/evaluation technical assistance, and USOE identification, validation, packaging and replication of local projects that have demonstrated their effectiveness for children. SEAs are granted up to one percent of the total State Title I allocation or $150,000, whichever is greater, to monitor and provide technical assistance to LEAs.

Program Scope

Preliminary data from the Office of Education's Consolidated Program Information Report (CPIR) for school year 1971-72, and summer school term 1972 which deals only with districts with more than 300 children enrolled, indicate that 6,780,186 children from low income areas, attending public and private schools in such districts, participated in Federally funded programs during that school year. A total of 5,551,508 of those children participated in Title I activities (LEA programs only) in public schools during the regular school year and summer school, while 261,788 children participated in Title I activities arranged for private schools under LEA programs during the regular school year and summer school. This makes a total of 5,813,356 children in districts with more than 300 pupils enrolled who were served by the Title I LEA program.

Again in districts with more than 300 children enrolled in 1971-72, 54,811 children in local institutions for the neglected and delinquent received Title I services under the LEA program during the regular school year, and 12,345 such children received services during the summer.

A count of migrant children in all districts regardless of the number of pupils enrolled indicated that a total of 225,505 migrant children participated in regular school year and summer programs during 1971-72.

A total of 53,339 public schools in districts with more than 300 pupils enrolled in all 50 States and the District of Columbia had children who participated in Federally funded programs for children from low income areas in 1971-72. There were also 5,825 private schools in such districts whose children received services from such programs.

The count of all districts regardless of the number of pupils enrolled indicated that 4,036 public schools and 26 private schools had provided such services to migrant children.

Program Effectiveness:

The overall effectiveness of Title I continues to be a highly debatable issue. Selected States and school districts report pronounced gains in the acquisition of basic skills during the school year. However, these results must be tempered by observing that critical review of such reports raises questions about their validity or how to interpret them, that the findings are not broadly representative and that, in general, as disadvantaged children progress through school they are apparently still falling behind their more advantaged peers. Despite these qualifications, it is almost certainly true that some compensatory education projects are working and probably true that some Statewide programs are effective. Moreover, there has probably been progress towards more effective programs over the last few years. Unfortunately, many economically disadvantaged children still are not being afforded an equal educational opportunity. These conclusions are expanded in the following paragraphs.

Though local Title I projects may have a wide variety of objectives, there is evidence that more than 50% of the money and perhaps as much as 68% is focused on improving basic skills in reading, language arts and mathematics. Within the area of basic skills the program seems to be even more sharply concentrated on improving reading ability in elementary schools (Planar, August 1973). Given this programmatic emphasis, it seems fair to regard change in reading achievement as the best single indicator of program effectiveness. Indeed most of the objective evaluative evidence from States and school districts is comprised of reading test scores. Similarly, the on-going OE study of Title I related projects is devoted exclusively to compensatory reading.

Taking reading achievement as a prime indicator of program success by no means solves the effectiveness issue because the ways of evaluating reading programs seem to be limitless. Two recent studies (Wargo, 1972 and Planar, August 1973) have attempted to sift through data from local, State and Federal evaluation efforts and to synthesize the findings. The conclusion from both efforts, heavily qualified and based upon achievement scores in basic skills, especially reading, was that there is evidence of positive program impact in a few States and in scattered projects in more States. From a review of a sample of twenty-six State Title I reports, reasonable confidence in the data from only two, California and Texas; taking 10 months of gain per year as the norm, California data showed an average gain across all grade levels of almost 12 months. This is certainly a positive finding. Texas showed an average gain of almost 7 months, but it is not clear from their report what the norm should be; it is probably closer to 8 months than to 10 months.

Generally speaking, there is no evidence of program failure in other States and communities; rather there is either no evidence at all or the evidence is not presented in such a way as to be persuasive. As noted in the Planar report, "...most LEA evaluation reports do not, in themselves, offer sufficient data for an outside reader to draw conclusions about the projects' impact upon pupil achievement" (Planar, August 1973).

The importance of independent, critical reviews of the evidence on the effectiveness of compensatory education can hardly be overstated if such evidence is to be used as a guide for policy making. In this connection, the Planar report gives several possible reasons why some of the large gains recently reported by some States and localities may be deceptively difficult to interpret. For example, a common and, in some cases, legitimate practice is to report scores only on children for whom there are both pre- and post-tests. However, since the children present both at the beginning and end of school are likely to be the most academically able, this kind of reporting will show greater gains than when all children in a program are accounted for. This and other analysis procedures probably somewhat inflate some of the State and local results. There may be a trend towards more such reports as noted by Planar (October, 1973): "We suspect that some of the apparent recent success of Title I can be attributed to new methods of computing and reporting achievement results, which are unrelated to any real improvement in achievement, and to refinements of the instructional process, which may not be in any lasting way beneficial to the students."

Thus, despite some progress, many economically disadvantaged children are probably still educationally disadvantaged. Evidence to that effect comes from a variety of sources. For example, recent results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (National Assessment Newsletter, 1972) indicate that, in the aggregate, economically disadvantaged children, as indexed by their parent's education levels, race and geographic locale of residence, still fall below the national medians on reading skills. Corroboration of these findings for children attending minority-isolated schools (50% or more of enrollment is non-white) was found as a result of achievement testing in a nationally representative sample of such schools in Spring of 1973. Conducted to obtain baseline data for subsequent evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Program, the findings were that children in grades 3, 4 and 5 averaged 1.2, 1.7 and 1.9 grades below the norms, respectively, on reading achievement and similar results were obtained for mathematics achievement (System Development Corporation, 1974). To some extent, these results reflect the current level of effectiveness of compensatory education but they also reflect the fact that compensatory programs such as Title I do not reach all eligible children.

The trade-off between serving many children at relatively low levels of service versus serving fewer children with higher concentration of resources has recently been given much attention. Several on-going evaluation studies are addressing the issue and solid evidence will be available in the near future. However, one, more limited investigation recently shed light on the subject by reanalyzing data from California. The finding was that there is modest positive relationship between Title I per-pupil expenditures and achievement gains for reading projects in schools with heavy concentrations of disadvantaged children. However, there was no evidence for the existence of a "critical mass" of compensatory expenditures such that expenditures above a certain level resulted in pronounced improvements in reading or math (Tallmadge, 1973).

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

1. A Study of the Effects of Compensatory Reading Programs on the Develop- of Reading Skills in Elementary Schools

The first phase of the study, which began in July 1971, was based on a Spring 1972 questionnaire survey of compensatory reading programs offered in grades 2, 4 and 6 in more than 700 U. S. public schools. The survey had two major purposes: (1) to obtain data for a representative national sample of programs which describes their instructional characteristics, the schools in which they were offered, and their instructional personnel; and (2) to serve as a basis for a more intensive study, including collection of before and after achievement data, during school year 1972-73.

The data obtained from the survey have been presented in the Phase I Report (Rubin, et.al, 1973). Because the study outcome measures from 1972-73 have not yet been analyzed, the Phase I report is not evaluative in nature. However, the preliminary data analysis does show that there is substantial variation among schools in the ways they approach compensatory reading and that it is possible to categorize the various approaches in meaningful ways. Later phases of the study will relate these approaches to student outcome measures and to costs.

The second phase of this study includes a comprehensive evaluation of compensatory reading programs in the subsample of 260 programs drawn from the Phase I survey. This phase analyzes various methods and categories of reading instruction and what benefits students derive from them. Student testing and other data collection have been completed and analysis of the data is underway; the final report is expected in the fall of 1974.

The third phase of the study was designed to provide an evaluation of summer compensatory reading programs at 27 selected schools. The subcontractor to ETS, which is RMC Research Corporation, has delivered Site Visit Reports for Summer Compensatory Reading Programs (Dienemann, et. al. 1973) which provides descriptive information on those programs. RMC is also working with ETS on an additional task of the second and third phases of the study, which is to do a cost-and-resources analysis of individual reading programs, and, subsequently, describe apparent relationships between program cost and program outcomes in terms of student achievement gains. In this task, the contractor will examine the relative merits of alternative compensatory reading programs and instruction methods, taking into account the observed program outcomes and costs.

2. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Programs for Migratory Children of Migratory Agricultural Workers

Section 507 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318) directed the Commissioner of Education to conduct a study of the Migrant Education program under ESEA Title I. The study is to evaluate specific programs and projects, evaluate State administration of those programs and projects, and make recommendations for improvement.

Ten States which receive a total of more than 75 percent of the program funds--California, Texas, Florida (home base States) and Washington, Colorado, Michigan, Ohio, North Carolina, New Jersey and New York (receiving States)--were chosen as the basis for the study. A total of 72 randomly selected projects in those States were visited to gather appropriate data. An additional 20 projects or activities in those States were also visited and described because of their noteworthy characteristics in improving migrant education.

3. Planning Study for Development of Project Information Packages for Effective Approaches in Compensatory Education

Under contract to OE's Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation, the RMC Research Management Corporation is conducting this study. Although not specifically directed at evaluation of ESEA Title I, the study is cited here because of its emphasis on the identification and validation of effective approaches in compensatory education funded through ESEA Titles I and III, and because of the "packaging" and replication thrust which it promotes as a systematic consequence of validated effectiveness.

The major objectives of the study are as follows: (1) to develop the criteria for identifying effective approaches to compensatory education which are amenable to replication, and to develop a process for utilizing those criteria (this task was completed in October 1973); (2) to design a Project Information Package (PIP) as the prime mechanism for replicating a validated effective approach to compensatory education, and to decide what the media of the PIP should be (this task was completed in December 1973); (3) to choose up to 8 effective approaches to compensatory education an to design Project Information Packages for them (this task is scheduled for completion in March 1974); (4) to prepare Project Information Packages for the up to 8 approaches selected (this task is scheduled for completion in June 1974); and (5) to prepare a final report on the development of Project information Packages. Although not a part of this study, a field test of the PIP's is being planned for the 1974-75 and 1975-76 school year.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. The Planar Corporation. *Title I Reading and Mathematics Programs: A Completion and Synthesis of Available Achievement, Expenditure and Model Project Information*. Washington, D. C., August 1973.

2. The Planar Corporation. *The Silken Purse: Legislative Recommendations for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.* Washington, D. C., October 1973.

3. Wargo, M. J. et. al. *ESEA Title I: A Reanalysis and Synthesis of Evaluation Data from Fiscal Year 1965 through 1970*. American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, Calif. March 1972 (ERIC No. ED 059415).

4. National Assessment of Educational Progress Newsletter, Vol. V, No. 6 October 1972.

5. Systems Development Corporation. *Emergency School Aid Act National Evaluation: Achievement Test Restandardization* Santa Monica, Calif., Forthcoming.

6. Tallmadge, G. K. *An Analysis of the Relationship Between Reading and Mathematics Achievement Gains and per-Pupil Expenditures in California Title I Projects, Fiscal Year 1972*. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research, March 1973. (ERIC No. ED 071189)

7. Rubin, D. et. al. *A Descriptive and Analytic Study of Compensatory Reading Programs*, Princeton, N. J. Educational Testing Service, August 1973.

8. Dienemann, P. et. al. *Site Visit Reports for Summer Compensatory Reading Programs,* Bethesda, Md. RMC Research Corporation, October, 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Supplementary Educational Centers and Services; Guidance, Counseling, and Testing

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, as amended	June 30, 1974

Funding History:	Year	Authorization*	Appropriation
	1966	$100,000,000	$75,000,000
	1967	180,250,000	135,000,000
	1968	515,000,000	187,876,000
	1969	527,875,000	164,876,000
	1970	566,500,000	116,393,000
	1971	566,500,000	143,393,000
	1972	592,250,000	146,393,000
	1973	623,150,000	146,393,000
	1974	623,150,000	146,393,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Title III provides funds to support local educational projects designed to: (1) stimulate and assist in the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs and (2) assist the States in establishing and maintaining programs of guidance, counseling, and testing. Beginning with FY 71, the states were responsible for administering 85 percent of the Title III funds by awarding grants to local school districts. The Commissioner of Education has responsibility for administering the remaining 15 percent of the funds. These discretionary funds also support local school projects, with awards based on their potential contribution to the solution of critical educational problems common to all or several States. For purposes of Title III, an innovative project is an approach or program new to the geographical area and designed to demonstrate a solution to a specific need. An exemplary project is one which has proven to be successful, is worthy of replication, and can serve as a model for other areas.

---

*An amount equal to 3 percent of funds appropriated is authorized for allotment to outlying areas, to schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and to overseas dependent schools operated by the Department of Defense.

The underlying rationale for Title III has been attributed to the Task Force on Education, appointed by the President in the summer of 1964. The Task Force believed that substantial educational change had failed to take place not because of a scarcity of new ideas and programs, but because the efforts to innovate and the mechanisms to disseminate innovative ideas had been on a scale far below the actual need. Title III, through its direct support for innovation, was intended to help meet that need.

Each State qualifies for funding under the State Plan portion of Title III by submitting an annual State Plan to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for approval. Funds are then allocated to the States on the basis of a population proportional formula. The restrictions on the use of Title III State-administered funds are: (1) 15 percent must be used for projects for the handicapped, and (2) expenditures for guidance, counseling, and testing purposes must be an amount equal to at least 50 percent of the amount expended by each State from funds appropriated for fiscal year 1970 for Title V-A of the National Defense Education Act.

Program Scope:

In the State Plan portion (85%) of Title III, 1703 demonstration projects were funded in FY 72. These projects involved 7.3 million students directly and an additional 12.4 million student indirectly, e.g., by their visiting exhibits or demonstrations, using Title III materials or equipment, receiving television instruction, or participating in similar activities.

In the federal discretionary portion (15%) of Title III, 630 demonstration projects were funded in FY 72. The general strategy pursued by this program is to provide sufficient funds to overcome the initial financial barriers that so often prevent school districts from undertaking developmental activities and installing new practices.

The following table shows for FY 72 the amount of Title III State plan and, Title III federal discretionary funds alloted to various types of projects.

Project Types	Distribution of Funds (in millions of dollars) Title III State Plan Portion (85%)	Title III Federal Discretion Portion (15%)
Reading	10.6	3.6
SWRL Kindergarten Reading	-	1.2
Environment/Ecology	4.2	1.9
Cultural Pluralism	-	.9
Early Childhood	5.6	2.8
Disadvantaged	-	1.9
Equal Educational Opportunity	5.7	-
Model Cities	1.7	-
Gifted	1.0	-
Handicapped	19.4	-
Special Education	-	.2
Drug Education	1.4	-
Guidance and Counseling	9.2	-
Educational Technology	-	1.1
Artists in Schools	-	1.0
Incentives in Education	-	.3
Extended School Year	-	.2
Other	40.0	5.0
Total*	98.8	20.1

Program Effectiveness

Because both the discretionary and State Plan portions of Title III fund diverse types of programs with a variety of goals, some cognitive and some not, it is not possible to assess overall program effectiveness in terms of students' achievement. Studies which have been performed concentrate on assessing Title III's effectiveness as a demonstration program; that is, on whether projects are innovative; whether they continue after the usual three-year federal funding period, and whether they are disseminated to and replicated by other schools and districts. Although the data addressing these points is scanty, the evidence available suggests that the State plan portion of Title III has been moderately successful in these respects. Because Title III discretionary funds have only been available since FY 71, it is too soon to get reliable answers to the continuation and replication questions for this program.

---

* The total amount of Title III funds spent on projects was $118.9 million. The difference between this figure and the $146.3 million appropriated is the $27.4 million which is used for program administration at the State level.

The importance of the innovative aspect of Title III is a concern of most groups associated with this program. For example, the authors in references 1 and 2 express concern that the program might emphasize services rather than innovation, and the President's National Advisory Council (Annual Report, 1969) reported that the original emphasis on innovation and creative programs was losing ground. Kearns (1969) substantiated that point of view. She stated that "Despite OE's emphasis on planning versus hardware, a large percentage of the projects in the first batch involved the procurement of shiny new equipment and fancy gimmicks." She expresses disappointment that these projects seemed to be content merely to add new things on top of existing structure, rather than to change these structures themselves. In later reviews, the President's National Advisory Council (Annual Reports, 1971, 1972, 1973) found the record more encouraging on the basis of reviews of selected projects, but they recommended changing the title to "Title III-Innovation in Education" to bring this major thrust into the fore.

Aspects of the continuation question have been explored in early years by Hearn (1969) and Polemeni (1969), however, the most recent and most thorough examination of this issue was done by Brightman (1971). He studied projects funded between 1966-1969, 1967-1970, and 1968-1971 and found that 64.4% of the projects in the first group were being continued at least in part, 67.0% of the projects in the second group, and 76.0% of the projects in the third group--the average figure for all three groups was 67.1%. Furthermore, he found that for all three-year projects which continued for some time after federal funding, 80.0% of the first group, 84.4% of the second group and 73.7% of the third group were in existence in the Fall of 1971. These data are summarized in the following table.

Time Interval	Percent of Projects Continued for Some Time After Federal Funding Ceased	Percent of Those Projects In Column 1 in Existence In the Fall of 1971
1966-1969	64.4%	80.0%
1967-1970	67.0%	80.4%
1968-1971	76.0%	73.7%
Average	67.1%	79.2%

Whether or not Title III projects have served as models which other schools or districts have adopted fully or in part has been a difficult question for researchers to answer because project people oftentimes do not know whether or not interested parties have in fact been able to replicate their Title III project. Brightman (1971) found that when school superintendents were asked if their project had been adopted in full by other school districts, 14.8% answered "YES", 53.0% answered "NO", and 32.2% were uncertain. When asked if the project had been adopted in part by the other school districts, 45.4% answered "YES, 13.3% answered "NO", while a surprising 41.0% were uncertain. These figures represent superintendents' opinions, which are probably based in most cases on an expression of intent from other districts. No attempt was made in this study to verify that projects had, in fact, been adopted elsewhere in full or in part.

The Office of Education has attempted to foster more dissemination and replication of exemplary projects by their "Identification, Validation, Dissemination" strategy. This process uses four criteria--innovativeness, effectiveness, exportability, and cost effectiveness--to determine the success of Title III projects. Validated projects become part of a pool of exemplary projects for dissemination to school districts throughout the Nation. Twelve Title III projects have been identified and validated by this process and have been cleared by the Federal Dissemination Review Panel for dissemination nationwide.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Education has contracted with the Rand Corporation to perform an evaluation of Title III (both the federal and state portions) along with three other OE demonstration programs. The study will document the extent to which each of these programs fund projects which are innovative, the extent to which projects are continued after federal funding terminates, and the extent to which projects are replicated by other schools. The study will also identify features or characteristics of these programs which promote or retard innovativeness, persistence, and replication, focusing particularly on administrative and structural variables of the programs themselves.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Catalyst for Change: A National Study of ESEA Title III (PACE): University of Kentucky, 1967.

2. PACE: Catalyst for Change, The Second National Study of PACE. University of Kentucky, 1968.

3. Hearn, Norman. Innovative Educational Programs: A Study of the Influence of Selected Variables Upon Their Continuation Following the Termination of Three Year Title III Grants. 1969.

4. Kearns, Doris. "The Growth and Development of Title III, ESEA, Education Technology, May, 1969, pp. 714.

5. Polemeni, Anthony J. A Study of Title III Projects, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 83-531 (89-10)), After the Approved Funding Periods. April, 1969.

6. Norman, Douglas and Balyeat, Ralph. "Whither ESEA III?" Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1973.

7. President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. PACE: Transition of a Concept, First Annual Report. 1969.

8. ________. The Rocky Road Called Innovation. Second Annual Report, 1970.

9. ________. Educational Reform Through Innovation, Third Annual Report, 1971.

10. ________. Time for a Progress Report Fourth Annual Report, 1972.

11. ________. Annual Report, ESEA Title III, Fifth Annual Report, 1973.

12. Consolidated Program Information Reports (Office of Education reporting form for program data).

13. Annual State Reports, ESEA Title III.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Strengthening State Departments of Education

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
ESEA Title V, Part A	June 30, 1974

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	$25,000,000	$17,000,000
	1967	30,000,000	22,000,000
	1968	65,000,000	29,750,000*
	1969	80,000,000	29,750,000
	1970	80,000,000	29,750,000
	1971	80,000,000	29,750,000
	1972	85,000,000	33,000,000
	1973	90,000,000	33,000,000
	1974	90,000,000	33,000,000

---

* Beginning in 1968, includes $7,750,000 formerly included in separate appropriations for the National Defense Education Act.

Program Purpose and Operation:

ESEA Title V, Part A, authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their education agencies and to assist these agencies in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet their educational needs. The grants are made to each SEA on the basis of project applications. OE approval of these State applications is required, following a determination that they conform to the broad purposes of Title V.

Ninety-five percent of the Title V, Part A, appropriation is available to State educational agencies as basic grants. Of this amount, two percent is set aside for distribution to the outlying areas on the basis of need as determined by the Commissioner of Education. The remainder is distributed to the 50 States and the District of Columbia by a formula which divides 40 percent of the amount equally and 60 percent on the basis of the number of public school pupils in each State.

The remaining five percent of the appropriation is reserved for special project grants to State education agencies to enable groups of these agencies to develop their leadership capabilities through experimental projects and to solve common high priority problems.

OE strategy is based upon providing technical assistance to State educational agencies to strengthen their capabilities to bring about desirable changes and improvements in State educational systems.

Program Scope:

States are directing over forty percent of their Title V, Part A funds towards strengthening services provided for local education agencies, such as identification and dissemination of successful practices, planning and installing up-to-date curricula in the schools, and improving evaluation strategies and administration. Thirty-one percent of the funds support administrative costs of the State agencies, and nineteen percent support program planning, development and evaluation. The remaining funds support other activities of the State agencies, such as accreditation, licensing, and staff development.

In FY 1972 the States used their basic grant funds by object of expenditure in the following manner:

	% of total
Salaries	70.4
Contracted services	6.3
Equipment	3.8
Other*	19.5

* Includes staff travel; fixed charges (rent, insurance); supplies, materials, printing.

Special project grants have been used by the SEAs for such purposes as development of educational finance models, systems to modernize educational management practices, and a plan for interstate certification of teachers. More than 60 interstate projects of varying duration and scope have been funded under this program.

Program Effectiveness:

The Title V objective to strengthen State Departments of Education poses substantial problems when it comes to measuring effectiveness of the program. The legislation suggests, but not mandate, ways in which the States might use the funds to strengthen their education agencies.

In a recent study the program was evaluated in terms of its impact on basic institutional change in the SEAs (Murphy, 1973). Nine State education agencies were studied, three of them in-depth. The author concluded that the impact of Title V and the degree of strengthening of SEAs varied significantly from State to State. In none of the States studied, moreover, did Title V promote basic change; this finding was more likely due to the way complex organizations behave with free money than to any particular administrative shortcomings at the Federal or State levels. Title V helped fill gaps in services and management and strengthened SEAs in this sense. Although it enable States to give more attention to some kinds of activities than they could have on their own, expansion took place largely in traditional areas. It did not stimulate the SEAs into developing new roles and activities, perhaps too much to expect of general aid within the organizational settings.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Murphy, Jerome T. Grease the Squeaky Wheel: A Report on the Implementation of Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Grants to Strengthen State Departments of Education. Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1973.

2. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, The Federal-State Partnership for Education, May 1970.

3. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, The State of State Departments of Education, March 1969.

4. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, Focus on the Future, March 1968.

5. Advisory Council on State Department of Education, Reinforcing the Role of the State in Education, March 1967.

6. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, Improving State Leadership in Education, March 1966.

7. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, State Departments of Education and Federal Programs, 1972.

8. Annual State Reports, ESEA V.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Bilingual Education

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Bilingual Education Act Title VII, ESEA	June 30, 1974

Funding History:	Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation:
	FY 68	$ 15,000,000	$ 0
	FY 69	30,000,000	7,500,000
	FY 70	40,000,000	21,000,000
	FY 71	80,000,000	25,000,000
	FY 72	100,000,000	34,902,000
	FY 73	135,000,000	35,080,000
	FY 74	135,000,000	50,350,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Bilingual Education Program is a discretionary grant program which provides funds to local educational agencies to carry out projects designed to meet the special educational needs of children of limited English-speaking ability who come from low-income families. The 1970 Census estimates five million of the total school age population come from homes where a language other than English is spoken, of which 3.4 million are Native American, Asian Americans or Spanish-speaking. Most of the remaining 1.6 million are from families of European origin. Exactly how many of these children know little or no English when they enter school is not known. Many, however, are fluent in their home language and have a cultural heritage and life style different than that of "mainstream America". Bilingual education seeks to build upon their differences and strengths by teaching subject matter in the home language and developing respect for the life style and heritage of the children.

Title VII is a demonstration program. Its primary focus, therefore is on demonstration and developmental activities; that is, activities which build up resources--materials, trained teachers, and model programs--needed to start bilingual projects. States and localities may use strategies and materials developed with Title VII funds to install bilingual projects using State, local or other federal (such as Title I) funds. As part of the demonstration strategy, the Office of Education is in the process of identifying projects of proven effectiveness and hopes to find at least 10 which can serve as models. These models will then be "packaged" and disseminated for replication.

Program Scope:

In FY 73 209 project grants were awarded, involving children from 24 different language groups. Of these 209 demonstration projects, 150 (72%) involved Spanish-speaking groups, 17 (8%) involved Native Americans (Indians and Eskimos), 2 (1%) involved Oriental groups, 11 (5%) involved "other" groups such as Portuguese-speaking or Russian-speaking, and 29 (14%) involved combinations of language groups, such as Spanish and Chinese or Spanish, Ute and Navajo. These bilingual projects are funded with discretionary grants given (1) to a local educational agency or group of such agencies or (2) to a local educational agency jointly with an institution of higher learning. In addition to funding instructional activities, Title VII also funds curriculum development, teacher training and research in testing.

Program Effectiveness:

Title VII is a demonstration program designed to meet the special educational needs of children who speak a language other than English. As such it is appropriate to judge (1) its effectiveness as a demonstration program and (2) its effectiveness in meeting the needs of these children. The evidence of effectiveness will be expanded upon in the following paragraphs. In general, it appears that Title VII has been effective as a demonstration program, mostly through informal means because formal attempts to identify and replicate exemplary projects are just getting underway. There is currently little "hard" data to tell whether or not Title VII is having a positive impact on the attitudes and learn- of children. However, a recently-completed process evaluation (Development Associates, Inc., 1973) found that Title VII projects have changed the ways in which schools meet the needs of the non-English-speaking population and offered impressionistic evidence that children were benefitting from the program.

The mission of this demonstration program is to build resources and set up federally-funded projects which can be adopted at other's expense, thereby spreading the particular educational practice beyond the boundaries of the federal program. It is appropriate, therefore, to judge the effectiveness of Title VII by measuring the extent to which projects (models) have been set up at federal expense and the extent to which these models have been adopted elsewhere at other expense. Although formal attempts at dissemination at the Federal level are just now getting underway, and although no projects have yet been officialy designated as models for national replication, many Title VII projects are being visited informally and some of these are being replicated. The process evaluation showed that 31 out of 34 randomly chosen projects had been visited by personnel from other schools interested in setting up a bilingual project, and that 10 of these projects had been replicated, at least partially, by one or more schools.

By its presence the Title VII program has provided visibility to the educational problems of a particular target group of children who had been virtually ignored previously. Since FY 69, the first year that bilingual projects were funded with Title VII monies, a growing interest in bilingual/bicultural education has developed. Because of heightened awareness of and interest in bilingual/bicultural education, the special needs of children whose dominant language is not English are increasingly being addressed by new legislation, programs, and money. For example, 10 states have passed legislation permitting a language other than English to be used as a medium of instruction and such legislation has been introduced in two other states. Prior to 1969 many states had laws expressly prohibiting such use. Nine states have money earmarked for some aspect of bilingual education, usually for teacher training or for actual classroom use. It is impossible to know to what extent the federal program is directly responsible for these changes in the educational system; however, Title VII is generally credited as being a prominent factor in promoting these changes.

Besides being evaluated on its effectiveness as a demonstration program, Title VII can also be evaluated on its effectiveness in producing positive changes in children in the cognitive, affective and behavioral areas. Currently the only source of data concerning the program's impact on children is the individua project evaluation reports submitted yearly; however, limitations in the data or methodologies prevent them from being used to draw conclusions about overall program effectiveness. During

FY 73 a process evaluation was performed which described in detail a sample of projects for Spanish-speaking children in the elementary grades and which provided the groundwork for a future evaluation assessing the impact of the program on children. Although the process evaluation did not collect outcome data on children, it did provide some useful impressions of effectiveness. The evaluators felt that the program had made an impressive start in its four yours of operation; they found an extra ordinary commitment and zeal among the staff. This process evaluation also highlighted some problem areas, the most severe being lack of trained bilingual teachers and lack of materials. Eighty percent of the project directors stated that there was a shortage of adequately trained teachers in their districts. It was also reported that persons in 61.8% of the projects felt that it was "somewhat" or "very difficult" to obtain materials, and furthermore that only one project was "totally satisfied" with the materials used. The projects in the sample were all serving Spanish-speaking children; the teacher and material situation is undoubtedly worse for most other language groups. The evaluators were cautious in interpreting the findings pertaining to materials. They pointed out that there is in reality an abundance of materials, especially in Spanish, developed both here and abroad. It appears that the problem is one of dissemination coupled with possible inappropriateness of materials.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies

An impact evaluation of Title VII will be initiated during FY 74. Goals of this evaluation are to assess the impact of Title VII on children in the cognitive, affective and behavioral domains and to determine to the extent possible which strategies are most effective.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Development Associates, Inc., A Process Evaluation of the Bilingual Education Program, Title VII, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Washington, D.C., December 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Follow Through

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (P. L. 90-222(a)(2))	June 30, 1974

Funding History	Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
	1968		$15,000,000
	1969		32,000,000
	1970		70,300,000
	1971	$70,000,000	69,060,000
	1972	70,000,000	63,030,000
	1973	70,000,000	57,700,000
	1974	70,000,000	41,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Follow Through is an experimental program designed to investigate a variety of approaches to increase the achievement of disadvantaged children in kindergarten through third grade. Twenty-two different educational models are being developed and tested, most at several sites. Each model is designed and monitored by a sponsoring group, such as a university or an educational research laboratory, and is implemented by means of a grant to a local educational agency.

Program Scope:

The U. S. Office of Education funds 170 local projects which were nominated by the State Education Agency and the State Economic Opportunity Office in accordance with USOE and OEO criteria. Eighty percent of the appropriation is alloted to the States in accordance with a formula established in the legislation and the remainder is awarded at the discretion of USOE. The last new projects were initiated in school year 1972-73.

A national evaluation designed by USOE is collecting data in 86 projects to assess ten of the models, as well as to measure the effects of the Follow Through experience on those disadvantaged children with and

---

1/ An authorization level was not specified prior to FY 71.

without Head Start. Though there are 170 local projects and approximately 90,000 students in Follow Through, not all are included in the national evaluation. Additional evaluative evidence is provided by models' sponsors and by local school districts.

Program Effectiveness:

The ultimate effectiveness of Follow Through will be determined by the degree to which it has fostered development of successful approaches to early childhood education of disadvantaged children. While it is too early to draw final conclusions, the evaluation evidence does suggest that some models are more effective than others. The magnitude of the effects, their stability over time and their consistency under different conditions are still being studied.

The national evaluation is designed primarily to identify which approaches are successful in producing educationally significant gains in areas such as cognitive achievement, achievement motivation, self-esteem and locus-of-control (i.e., feelings of competence about one's ability to influence important events in his life). The national evaluation is longitudinal and involves four entering classes, called cohorts of children. In general, children are tested as they enter school (either kindergarten or first grade), at some intermediate points, and when they leave the program at the end of the third grade. The following chart shows the progression of children involved in the evaluation through the grades by cohort and by school year.

	School Year						
	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Cohort 1	K	1	2	3			
	1	2	3				
Cohort 2		K	1	2	3		
		1	2	3			
Cohort 3			K	1	2	3	
			1	2	3		
Cohort 4				K	1	2	3
				1	2	3	

As can be seen in the foregoing chart, only a few children have graduated from the program to date.

For technical reasons, the best cohort for judging model effectiveness is cohort 3, which completed the first year of Follow Through in Spring of 1972. The results can only be interpreted as suggestive because the only data which have been analyzed for this group are the scores at the end of the first year in school. The results show that there is substantial variation among models with respect to the various outcome measures. The findings are summarized in the table below. The first column shows the number of models for which Follow Through children score better than non-Follow Through comparison children to a degree that is educationally significant. The second column shows the number of models for which comparison children do better than Follow Through children and the third column shows the number of models for which the differences do not appear to be educationally significant.

Summary of One-Year Effects for Cohort 3

Measure	FT Better than NFT	NFT Better than FT	No significant Difference Between FT and NFT
Wide Range Achievement Test	4	0	6
MAT* Listening	2	1	7
MAT Reading	4	1	5
MAT Numbers	4	2	4
Achievement Motivation	8	1	1
Locus of Control I	1	1	8
Locus of Control II	3	0	7
Absenteeism	2	0	8

* Metropolitan Achievement Test

The pattern of effects may change as children progress through school. For example, the models which have shown positive effects on cognitive skills after the first year generally stress early academic achievement. Other models, which have a more non-cognitive emphasis in kindergarten, may produce positive effects at a later time. Conclusions about the effectiveness of various models in the national evaluation will be based upon the results of cohort 3 after third grade with supplemental information from other cohorts.

Surveys of both parents and teachers suggest that communities have positive regard for Follow Through programs. Follow through parents report a higher degree of involvement in school and community affairs than do non-Follow Through parents. In addition, Follow Through teachers indicate satisfaction with the methods offered by Follow Through. Findings are mixed with regard to how important teachers view the parents' role in the education of the child. For the most part, the above findings of positive parent and teacher effects are relatively stable across the first three cohorts.

It is emphasized that the above statements are not conclusive, but they suggest a trend to be examined over time. Stronger evidence on the effects of Follow Through will be forthcoming over the next few years as more cohorts of children complete the program and data from all sources are analyzed.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies

The Stanford Research Institute is under contract to USOE to do the data collection and data processing for the national evaluation of Follow Through. Abt Associates, Inc. is under contract to analyze the data. USOE will synthesize the findings from sponsor and local project evaluation reports.

Sources of Evaluation Data

1. Abt Associates, Inc. (Draft Report) Annual Report on the Evaluation of Follow Through, Cambridge, Massachusetts, October, 1973.

2. Local Project Evaluation Reports.

3. Sponsor Evaluation Reports.

Program Name:

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (SAFA) - Maintenance and Operation

Legislation:

P. L. 81-874

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1974*

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$ 359,450,000	$332,000,000
	1966	388,000,000	388,000,000
	1967	433,400,000	416,200,000
	1968	461,500,000	416,200,000
	1969	560,950,000	505,900,000
	1970	650,594,000	505,400,000
	1971	935,295,000	536,068,000
	1972	1,024,000,000	592,580,000
	1973	1,127,011,000**	635,495,000
Progra	1974	1,122,000,000***	574,416,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

P. L. 81-874 provides financial aid for maintenance and operation to school districts which have been affected by the existence of Federal installations in these areas. The purpose of the legislation is to minimize the fiscal inequities caused by both the presence of tax-exempt Federal lands and the burden of providing public school education to school children who reside on federal property or whose parent is employed on federal property. Payments are made directly to the LEAs and are based on local education costs and on the number of children whose parents either live or work on United States government property (designated B pupils), or who do both (designated as A pupils), or who have a parent on active duty in the uniformed services (either A or B pupils).

Also under this law, assistance may be provided to a school district located in a major disaster area as proclaimed by the President. Such assistance may be: (1) repair or replacement of equipment, materials, and supplies; minor repairs to facilities, and provision of temporary facilities, and (2) assistance to suppor the level of education within the school district that was maintaining prior to the disaster. Assistance is provided upon application.

---

*Provisions pertaining to A pupils and children attending schools on Federal installations are permanent.

**Includes disaster provisions.

***Subject to change. Does not include disaster provisions.

Program Scope:

P.L. 874 is the closest approximation of general aid from the Federal Government available to eligible school districts. Funds received under P. L. 81-874 usually are deposited in the school district's general operating fund and expended in accordance with State law and practice. The number of school children counted for aid purposes in 1972 was 2,425,000, the total number of children attending schools in these eligible LEAs amounted to 24,000,000. Since the funds are deposited in the general operating account some or all of these children could conceivably benefit from the SAFA aid. In calculating basic law entitlements, school districts are reimbursed for the local cost of A pupils and for half of the local cost for B pupils.

Major Disaster Assistance Obligations and Expenditures to date are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Obligated	Expanded
1966	$3,936,146	$3,936,146
1967	790,411	790,411
1968	3,274,628	3,274,628
1969	2,615,130	2,615,130
1970	5,172,071	5,170,682
1971	11,800,927	11,740,560
1972	41,779,798	35,447,268
1973	66,838,545	10,213,497
Total	$136,207,656	$73,149,322

Program Effectiveness:

The SAFA program is not designed to produce measurable outcomes in school children. However, in the implementation of this legislation various anomalies have appeared. These have been amply documented in an extensive study conducted by the Battelle Memorial Institute under the direction of the U. S. Office of Education. The study concludes that certain school districts are being over-compensated for the real or presumed burden of Federal activity as a result of one or more of the following situations:

1. Payments that far exceed the cost to the local government of educating Federal pupils.
2. Payments to wealthy school districts which could finance better-than-average school costs even without SAFA aid.
3. Payments to districts where the economic activity occurring on non-taxable Federal lands (e.g., a leased oil well or an aircraft company on Federal property) generates enough local taxes to support increased school costs.

4. Payments to school districts which are compensated twice for the same government impact under different Federal legislation. For example, some districts benefit from shared revenues, such as timber and Taylor grazing revenues from public lands and are entitled to impact aid under P.L. 81-874. "Because impact aid is based upon the student population rather than property characteristics, the two payments frequently overlap to the benefit of the school district."

5. Some overcompensation to school districts since States are prevented from considering SAFA aid payments in calculating State aid. Districts which are entitled to impact aid benefit from those State aid formulas which attempt equalization. In some SAFA districts, the presence of Federal land reduces the per pupil assessed valuation causing State aid payments to rise.

6. Higher per pupil payments to rich districts than to poor ones resulting from the inclusion of local expenditure in calculating the aid formula.

7. Children are counted who would be attending school in a district even if the Federal Government had never come into the area. As an example, Battelle cites the case of farmers who take employment at an airbase and still maintain their farm residences in neighboring school districts which may now qualify for SAFA aid.

8. Payments that often do not reflect the economic stimulus that the Federal Government may cause in a community.

In a few instances, school districts are underpaid under the present law. For example, in one school district, government-owned house trailers were parked on private property near an airbase. In this instance, neither the airbase nor the trailers were subject to taxation and the school district was only able to impose property taxes on the relatively poor land on which the trailers were parked. In determining its entitlement, the school district was paid on the basis of B pupils because their residence was on private taxable property.

As a result of these observations, Battelle proposed specific changes in the legislative formula. Payments should be reduced to school districts for the so-called B students, (i.e., those students whose parents work on Federal property but live on private property) by modifications to the existing law:

(1) Absorption - Paying only for those students in a school district that exceed the Federal impact on all districts. This average impact for Federal

activity was estimated at 3% of all students for the country as a whole. Under the present law, when the number of eligible students in any LEA exceed 3% of the average daily attendance by even one student, then all of the eligible are counted for impacted aid purposes.

(2) Change in rate of payment - Changing the payment rate for B pupils from the current level of 50% of the A students, i.e., those whose parents live and work on Federal property, to 40% of the A students. The rationale offered for this change is that school districts are presumed only to lose an estimated 40% of property tax revenues normally paid by business, which, for the parents of B students, is the untaxable Federal property where they work.

(3) Richness cutoffs - Reducing or eliminating districts that have an average tax base that is 25% above State average per pupil tax base. The present law has no such cut-off.

Battelle also suggested that the local tax effort be taken into account in devising any formula changes; that Federal in-lieu-of-tax payments, shared revenues and other special payments be deducted from impact aid payments; and that the capital cost program (P. L. 815) be merged with the operating cost program (P.L. 874).

Several legislative proposals for program reform have been transmitted to Congress. To date, none of these proposals have been acted upon.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Battelle Memorial Institute, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: A Study of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, published by Committee on Education and Labor, H.R., 91st Congress, 2nd Session, G.P.O., 1970.

2. Administration of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, G.P.O., 1970.

Program Name:

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (SAFA): Construction

Legislation: P.L. 81-815

Expiration Date: June 30, 1974*

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$58,400,000	$58,400,000
1966	50,078,000	50,078,000
1967	58,000,000	52,937,000
1968	80,620,000	22,937,000
1969	79,162,000	14,745,000
1970	80,407,000	15,181,000
1971	83,000,000	15,000,000
1972	91,250,000	20,040,000
1973	72,000,000	25,910,000
1974	72,000,000**	19,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

P. L. 81-815 is designed to provide local education agencies with financial aid for school construction under specified conditions. P. L. 81-815 authorizes financial assistance to eligible LEAs for construction of urgently needed minimum school facilities in school districts which have had substantial increases in school membership as a result of new or increased Federal activities (Section 5). Financial assistance is also available to a school district for the construction of temporary school facilities where the Federal impact is expected to be temporary (Section 9). The law also allows the Commissioner to make arrangements for providing minimum school facilities for federally-connected children if no tax revenues of the state or its political subdivisions may be spent for their education or if the Commissioner finds that no local education agency is able to provide a suitable free public education (Section 10). Assistance is authorized for construction of minimum school facilities in local education agencies serving children residing on Indian lands--(Subsections 14(a) and (b)). Under subsection 14(c) assistance is authorized also to financially distressed local education agencies which have substantial Federal lands and substantial numbers of pupils inadequately housed by minimum school facilities. Emergency aid is available to LEAs for the reconstruction of school facilities destroyed or seriously damaged in school districts located in declared major disaster areas (Section 16).

---

* Provisions pertaining to section 5(a)(1) pupils, sections 10 and 14 are permanent.

** Subject to change.

Since FY 1967, Federal funds appropriated for P.L. 81-815 have been substantially below the amounts required for funding of all qualified applicants under the Act. OE has utilized a system of priorities required by the law to determine the applications to be funded. Each section of the law has a priority ranking and within each section the priority of an application is based on the relative urgency of need.

All grants are made to qualified school districts on the basis of applications. The amount of payment to the LEA varies according to the section under which an applicant applies. Under Section 5, payment varies between 45% and 95% of actual per pupil construction costs depending on whether eligibility stemmed from "A" or "B" pupils.* Sections 9 and 10 provide for total payment of school construction costs for those pupils who are eligible to be counted for payment and who are also unhoused. Federal grants to provide needed minimum school facilities for children residing on Indian lands vary from 100 percent under subsection 14(b) to the difference between available State and local funds and the total project cost under subsection 14(a). Section 16 also requires that the Federal share be a residual payment after all other sources of aid have been utilized.

Since 1966, the number of classrooms provided and pupils housed is as follows: (Note: These figures do not correspond to Fiscal Year appropriations.

Section & fiscal year	Classrooms provided	Pupils housed
Sections 5, 8, 9		
1973	210	5,910
1972	0	0
1971	58	220
1970	7,901	201,770
1969	2,416	98,390
1968	903	27,218
1967	1,100	33,355
1966	1,630	47,405

---

* See School Assistance for Federally Affected Areas Maintenance and Operations, for an explanation of "A" and "B" pupils.

Section and fiscal year	Classrooms provided	Pupils housed
Section 14		
1973	28	800
1972	5	100
1971	73	1,710
1970	11	332
1969	21	566
1968	21	690
1967	16	435
1966	87	2,600
Section 10		
1973	0	0
1972	0	0
1971	161	4,151
1970	37	746
1969	137	3,704
1968	38	813
1967	100	2,440
1966	191	5,486
Section 16		
1973	49	1,380
1972	146	3,890
1971	71	1,760
1970	40	1,155
1969	22	590
1968	21	590
1967	9	270
1966	0	0

Beginning in FY 1966 when major disaster assistance was authorized approximately $22 million has been obligated to reconstruct facilities destroyed or seriously damaged by hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, and floods. About 70 percent of that assistance was approved in the past two fiscal years.

Program Effectiveness:

An evaluation of P.L. 81-815 was contained in the study by the Battelle Memorial Institute. The study concluded that with its systems of project by project approval the administration of P.L. 815 is unnecessarily complicated. Furthermore, "because capital projects are easily deferrable in the Federal budget, P.L. 815 provides for uncertain levels of support based upon a priority system that tends to penalize a district that proceeds on its own to provide classrooms for Federally connected students."

Under P. L. 815, an eligible district which applies for Federal funds must show an increase in school membership over a 4-year period prior to receiving a project approval. In periods of partial funding (as in the present), the Act specifies which sections shall be funded first from any appropriation.

As presently worded, P. L. 81-815 makes no provision for the depreciation of schools built with Federal funds. The law is concerned with increases in Federally connected children. Should the number of Federally connected children become stable in the long run and should facilites initially provided under P. L. 81-815 become obsolete, then replacement costs would have to be borne solely by the school district.

In its study of SAFA, Battelle recommended that the capital cost program (P.L. 815) applicable to the usual situations be merged with the operating cost program (P.L. 874) in order to simplify its administration.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Battelle Memorial Institute, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: A Study of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, published by the Committee on Education ald Labor, H.R. 91st Congress, 2nd Session, GPO, 1970.

2. Administration of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Public Law 91-380	June 30, 1971
Continuing Resolution 92-38	February 22, 1972
Public Law 92-607	June 30, 1973

President Nixon proposed the $1.5 billion Emergency School Aid Act of 1970 on May 21, 1970, to meet special needs of desegregating school districts. Pending Congressional approval of that Act, on August 18, 1970 Congress appropriated $75 million, as a short term emergency measure to meet such needs, and thus established ESAP. The ESAP appropriation was based upon existing legislative authorities.

While Congressional approval of the Emergency School Aid Act was still pending the ESAP program was extended by Continuing Resolution to assist local education agencies and community groups for the 1971-72 school year and part of the 1972-73 school year. With the passage of the new Act, no funds were appropriated for ESAP in Fiscal Year 1974.

Funding History	Fiscal Year	Appropriation
	1971	$75,000,000
	1972	$75,000,000
	1973	$21,000,000
	1974	0

Program Purpose and Operation:

The general purpose of the ESAP program was stated in the ESAP regulations to be to:

> Meet special needs . . . incident to the elimination of racial segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in elementary and secondary schools by contributing to the costs of new or expanded activities . . . designed to achieve successful desegregation and the elimination of all forms of discrimination in the schools on the basis of students or faculty being members of a minority group.

ESAP Assistance was used to support a range of school district operational costs. To achieve the program's purpose and objectives there were five activities to help with problems related to desegregation funded under this appropriation. These were: (1) special community programs; (2) special pupil personnel services; (3) special curriculum revision programs and teacher preparation programs; (4) special student to student activities; and (5) special comprehensive planning.

Another component of ESAP was the Community Groups Program. This program authorized the Commissioner of Education to make grants or contracts with public or non-profit private organizations (other than school districts) if he determined that such action would assist in implementing local desegregation plans. This activity was allocated ten percent of the total funds. The stated objectives of the CGP were to promote community participation in school desegregation, maintain quality education during desegregation, aid in curriculum revision, establish communication between previously segregated student bodies, and help provide comprehensive planning and logistical support to implement desegregation plans.

Program Scope

During the period of August to November 1970, 900 ESAP-I grants were made to school districts for a total of $63,325,000. During the period of August to November 1971, 452 grants were made to districts for a total of $63,975,398. During the period July 1 to August 17, 1972, 395 grants were made to districts for a total of $17,523,000.

Under ESAP-I, a school district was eligible for financial assistance if (1) it was desegregating its schools under a final State or Federal court order or under a voluntary plan approved by HEW as meeting the nondiscrimination requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and (2) it commenced the terminal phase of such plan or court order by the opening of the 1970-71 academic year or had commenced such terminal phase during the 1968-69 or 1969-70 academic year.

Three priority groups were established for funding under ESAP-II. Priority I districts were those required to take new or additional steps respecting desegregation pursuant to a court order or order under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 issued or modified on or after April 20, 1971 (the date of the United States Supreme Court decision in the case of Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education). Priority II districts were those required to take new or additional steps in 1971-72 although the Title VI plan or court order was issued prior to April 20, 1971. Priority III districts were those which received ESAP grants prior to July 1, 1971 (i.e., ESAP-I grantees).

The amended regulations for continuation of ESAP II in the 1972-73 school year restricted eligibility to those grantees, either school districts or community groups, which had received grants during June 1971 under ESAP I or under the ESAP II program. The purpose of these regulations was to provide grantees with continued funding until they were able to apply for funds under the Emergency School Aid Act. Expenditure categories under ESAP II continuation activities were limited to salaries of personnel and minor related expenses.

In the first year of program operation, thirteen States in the South and Southwest had 150 ESAP Community Group Program projects with grants totaling about $7.5 million and running from approximately March 1971 to August 1972. Under ESAP-II, CGP grants amounting to $6.9 million awarded for 142 projects. Under the ESAP-II continuation activities, there were 111 grants to community groups totaling $945,000.

Program Effectiveness of ESAP-II School District Grants

Evidence from a major evaluation of the ESAP-II program shows that ESAP caused improved scholastic achievement among black high school males. These results did not extend, however, to other types of students. Overall student achievement effects were neglibible elsewhere as were overall changes in racial attitudes for all major student classifications. Some program activities were found to be relatively more effective than others, both with respect to achievement and racial attitudes. More details and a discussion of apparent causes of the results are reported below.

The ESAP-II evaluation marked the use of a randomized evaluation design for the first time in a large-scale education study. This constitutes an important technical advance and thus merits special attention. The design randomly selected matched pairs of schools, one selected at random to receive ESAP funds, and the other to be a control school not to receive ESAP funds. This experimental design is valuable because it provides a means of directly measuring the effects of ESAP funds (since the ESAP and control schools should differ only in one way--receiving or not receiving ESAP funds).

This study, conducted under contract to the Office of Education by the National Opinion Research Center, examined approximately 600 schools in 103 Southern school districts receiving ESAP-II grants. Over 32,000 fifth and tenth grade students were included in the study.

Among the major findings directly related to ESAP are:

- Black male high school students gained in achievement through ESAP. Their test scores were almost one-half grade level higher than black male students in matched control schools that received no ESAP funds.

- There is no evidence that ESAP raised the achievement of whites at either grade level, elementary school blacks, or female high school blacks. Yet the gains for black high school males are important because they have the lowest levels of achievement.

- There were no overall gains in student racial attitudes for either race or grade level as a result of ESAP. Favorable or unfavorable race relations effects may well exist but it is clear that race relations in schools are complex--schools that have good student racial attitudes are not conveniently also uniformly low in racial tension and high in interracial contact, for example.

- The achievement gain for black male high school students through ESAP could not be attributed to specific ESAP activities but to the climate ESAP helped to create. It appears that the big difference between high schools, where ESAP partially succeeded in raising achievement, and elementary schools, where it did not, is that only high schools tended to spend ESAP funds to change the way racial issues were handled. This seems to be due to: (1) the different uses of ESAP funds in elementary and secondary schools, (2) the fact that blacks in ESAP high schools were more likely than blacks in the matched control (non-ESAP) high schools to perceive the staff as pro-integration, and (3) the fact that blacks in ESAP high schools were more likely than blacks in the control schools to report that they like school.

- Looking now at different types of programs (rather than overall program effectiveness), there is evidence that human relations activities--student human relations programs, teacher human relations programs (not general teacher education programs), and human relations literature--were effective in improving the racial attitudes of urban white students at both grade levels, but especially in high schools. ESAP provided substantial support for such activities at the high school level. Gains in white students' racial attitudes are especiall encouraging because their racial attitudes were less equalitarian than those of black students. Here ESAP human relations activities seem to have partly succeeded; they apparently helped improve urban white racial attitudes but not those of rural whites.

- Basic instructional services programs--such as remedial programs, remedial specialists, and teacher aides--were not effective either in improving racial attitudes or in raising achievement in this sample of Southern desegregated schools. There is some evidence, however, that the heavy utilization of instructional equipment for students to use (perhaps supplemented by an audio-visual specialist in the school), raises student achievement in high schools. The report suggests further research and experimentation in this area rather than extensive implementation of such programs; few schools in this study had audio-visual specialists and over the years other reports have documented examples of instructional equipment lying unused in schools.

The study also examined the desegregation process more generally and found:

1. Effects on Integration on Achievement

   - The effects of school racial composition on achievement were generally small. Both races did less well in schools that were over 70 percent white, and most groups did best in racially mixed schools (41-70 percent white). Fears that white achievement has suffered because of Southern school desegregation appear to be unfounded.

   - What goes on within a desegregated school has important effects on the achievement of both races. The racial atmosphere is important. Liberal white racial attitudes seem to improve black performance at both grade levels. Racial tension is detrimental to white high school students' achievement. In short, the quality of race relations within desegregated schools is an important concern.

2. Other Ways Schools Can Affect Race Relations

   The report presents important findings for three areas of school race relations: (1) student racial attitudes (2) student feelings of "belonging" in their school, and (3) teacher prejudice and behavior.

   - Students of both races (with the exception of high school blacks) have more positive racial attitudes the longer their experience with school desegregation. Furthermore, both races tend to have more favorable racial attitudes when the staff is pro-integration. White urban students' racial attitudes are more favorable when the school clearly operates in a nondiscriminatory fashion (as indicated by such factors as desegregation of both PTA officers and the student leadership in the school as well as interracial contact among the teachers).

   - Students were asked if they felt they belonged in their school. Whites and blacks at both grade levels felt more at home on their own turf; that is, whites were more comfortable in predominantly white schools and blacks were more comfortable in predominantly black schools. While desegregation places a great deal of strain on students of both races, as evidenced in the above findings, the school is not the powerless victim of its racial composition. Black students are more comfortable when they feel that their teachers support desegregation. White students are more comfortable when desegregation is proceeding smoothly, with teachers reporting few desegregation problems and no cancellation of high school activities due to race problems.

- Teachers' personal feelings about race are not easily changed, but the way they react to the desegregated school, and more importantly, the way their actions are perceived by their students, can be changed. The key appears to be having a racially liberal (or, possibly, a black) principal. This is especially significant for black high school students, who appear to be more sensitive to the actual behavior of teachers than to their racial attitudes. If the principal sets a tone of fairness and tolerance for the school, the teachers tend to conform to these standards; as a consequence, blacks react favorably and view the staff as supporting desegregation. ESAP may have made a contribution to this: black students in the ESAP high schools were somewhat more likely to view the staff as supporting desegregation than were black students in the control (non-ESAP) high schools. (However, there is no relationship between having liberal racial programs in the school and black students' perception of staff support for desegregation.)

3. Effects of Busing and Attending Neighborhood Schools

- Virtually without exception, there were no effects of these variables (amount of busing and attendance in neighborhood schools) on educational outcomes.

Program Effectiveness of ESAP-I Community Groups

The diversity of activities undertaken by Community Group projects has precluded an overall assessment of the program in terms of direct effects on participants. However, an evaluation conducted in thirteen states in the South and Southwest during 1971-72 provided an overall description of the program and topped the perceptions of participants and community leaders as to the types of desegregation problems faced by Community Groups and their relative success in dealing with the different problems. In general, it appears that the most pressing desegregation problems are in the human relations area and that is also perceived as the area of greatest success for CGP notwithstanding the fact that the greatest number of project activities are associated with support of more direct educational objectives (e.g., 15 of the 35 projects surveyed reported tutorial programs). More detailed findings are given below.

Thirty-five of the 150 ESAP-CG projects funded, accounting for $1.4 million in funding, were the subject of an evaluation by Kirschner Associates, Inc. under contract to the Office of Education. The principal purposes of this evaluation were to provide a description of the Community Group segment of the Emergency School Assistance Program during its first year of operation and to gain an understanding of its strengths or weaknesses based upon the perceptions of persons knowledgeable about the program.

The principal findings of the evaluation are:*

- The most frequently occurring problems arising from desegregation efforts were associated with:
    racial relations in the community at large;
    relations between students of different races; and
    school-community relations.

- Project participants (i.e., parents, teachers, students, etc.) identified the most serious problems as:
    racial relations in the community at large;
    relations between students of different races;
    school-community relations;
    relations between faculty and students of different races;
    the classroom performance of students; and
    the quality of teachers' classroom performance.

- The desegregation problems most frequently attacked by community groups were associated with:
    relations between students of different races;
    school-community relations; and
    racial relations in the community at large.

- The types of desegregation problems least often attacked by community groups were:
    inadequate school facilities;
    displacement of minority teachers; and
    transportation and busing.

- The most common activities engaged in by community groups were:
    support of educational programs;
    dissemination of information about the local ESAP-CGP or desegregation in general;
    human relations discussions, workshops, seminars, etc., and;
    recreational, cultural or social pursuits.

---

*Except where noted the findings are based upon analyses of unweighted responses from all interviewees.

- Community groups were regarded as most successful when dealing with:
  - problems of relations between students of different races;
  - school-community relations;
  - racial relations in the community at large;
  - student academic performance; and
  - faculty-student racial relations.

- Community groups were regarded as least successful when dealing with:
  - problems of inadequate school facilities;
  - transportation and busing;
  - displacement of minority teachers;
  - lack of minority input/influence; and
  - resegregation.

- The community group program might be improved by closer cooperation between community group projects and LEA projects, more technical assistance when requested by community groups and closer monitoring by the Office of Education.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

1. Study of the Identification of Exemplary Desegregated Schools and Evaluation of the Determinants of Success, under contract with Educational Testing Service.

2. Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act Basic LEA Program, under contract with System Development Corporation.

3. A Longitudinal Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act Pilot Programs, under contract with System Development Corporation.

Source of Evaluation Data

1. Robert L. Crain and others, Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of School Desegregation, 2 volumes, Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1973.

2. Eugene P. Seefeldt, ESAP Community Group: An Evaluation, Washington D.C.: Kirschner Associates, Inc., November 1972.

3. Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, Bethesda, Maryland: Resource Management Corporation, 1971.

4. Need to Improve Policies and Procedures for Approving Grants under the Emergency School Assistance, Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office, 1971.

5. Weaknesses in Schoool Districts' Implementation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, Washington, D. C.: General Accounting Office, 1971.

6. The Emergency School Assistance Program: An Evaluation, prepared by Washington Research Project and five other civil rights organizations, 1970.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Training and Advisory Services (Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352)	indefinite

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	indefinite	$6,000,000
	1966		6,275,000
	1967		6,535,000
	1968		8,500,000
	1969		9,250,000
	1970		12,000,000
	1971		16,000,000
	1972		14,600,000
	1973		21,700,000
	1974		21,700,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Title IV is designed to provide assistance with problems incident to school desegregation. Section 403 of the act provides for technical assistance during the preparation, adoption, or implementation of a school desegregation plan to any governmental unit legally responsible for operating a public school or schools upon submission of application to the Commissioner of Education. Such assistance is normally provided through technical assistance centers maintained in various universities or through State Education Agencies. Section 404 authorizes the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation of short-term or regular session institutes for special training designed to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other elementary or secondary school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation. Section 405 of the act authorizes the Commissioner, upon application of a school board, to make grants to such board to pay, in whole or in part the cost of (a) inservice training for teachers and other school personnel, (b) employing specialists to advise in problems incident to desegregation.

Program Scope

In Fiscal Year 1973, Title IV funds and number of grants (not including continuations) were distributed approximately as follows:

	Percent of Funds	Number of Grants
General assistance centers	48%	27
State education agencies	23%	34
University Training institutes	22%	44
School district grants	8%	26
	100%	131

This allocation differs from recent years mainly in the increase of funding general assistance centers in the North and West to meet new or potential needs for desegregation in those areas. Also, school district grants under Title IV were sharply reduced from prior years because of the availability of similar assistance through the new Emergency School Aid Act.

Program Effectiveness:

The effectiveness of Title IV must be based primarily on qualitative evidence which is subject to differing interpretations. The major criticisms of the program and steps taken to remedy them (mainly incorporated in formal program regulations which were adopted in late Fiscal Year 1973) are discussed below. Since there have been few formal evaluations of Title IV and none by the Office of Education at the same time that new program regulations have been adopted, an OPBE Title IV evaluation is scheduled to begin in Fiscal Year 1974.

The most significant differences among existing studies involve the role of the Title IV University Desegregation Centers (now replaced by General Assistance Centers under the new regulations). A report filed in 1971 by the Washington Research Project, an independent non-government agency, concluded that the performance of the University Desegregation Centers was uneven; they operate in isolation in that they have no viable relationship with other federal programs, regional educational labs, or the Office for Civil Rights, and in general, they do not consult with groups dealing with school desegregation litigation. The report found a lack of leadership by the Office of Education in setting standards and initiating communication among the centers. It further found that the Centers were "unable to resolve what they perceive to be conflicting roles--that of desegregation plan development and provisions of educational services, and have never carried on both roles creatively."

The comments of the Washington Research Project were supported in an independent report of March, 1970 prepared by the Race Relations Information Center of Nashville, Tennessee. One significant conclusion in this report was that in some cases Title IV was being used as a means of evading desegregation, or stalling for more time.

A report released in January 1973 by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights critically reviewed the history of the program and recommended several changes in program administration. Among the major criticisms in the report were the observations that the school district projects were primarily directed and staffed by local school district personnel who seldom had influence over school district policies on desegregation, and that the State Title IV units and the university desegregation centers were predominantly staffed by white southerners whose previous education and experience were obtained in segregated southern school systems. One result has been that the programs developed with Title IV assistance frequently have been geared to making minority students conform to white middle class values and standards of achievement. On the basis of this and evidence that Title IV grants to LEAs and university desegregation centers have been used to fund training programs in compensatory education without emphasis on the problems of desegregation, the report recommended that the Office of Education adopt clear guidelines requiring that the primary emphasis of all projects must deal directly with problems of desegregation and that all Title IV recipients must be required to assure appropriate representation of all racial and ethnic groups, on an integrated basis, in staffing the project. The report also suggested giving priority to adequately funding those project applications that have the highest likelihood that Title IV assistance will be helpful rather than distributing the funds generally as an entitlement program.

The Commission report also suggested that the Office of Education should sponsor an annual training institute for representatives of current and potential Title IV recipients which would assure a common understanding of objectives, strategies, and permissable activities , which has been lacking throughout the history of the program. Criticizing the lack of reliable, systematic evaluation information on the effectiveness of Title IV, the report recommended that additional funds be provided for evaluation of all Title IV projects by a unit of the Office of Education independent of the Title IV office or by contract with private organizations. The refunding of any Title IV project would be contingent upon completion of this evaluation.

Previous evaluations of Title IV had discussed the incongruous roles of the university desegregation centers in attempting both to provide needed technical assistance to desegregating school districts and to provide technical expertise to federal courts in desegregation litigation against school districts. In January 1972 the Office of Education forbade university desegregation centers from continuing to provide this assistance to courts except at the specific request of a school district. The Commission report criticized this change in policy, recommending that the Office of Education "require (Title IV) recipients to offer the full range of their knowledge and experience in helping to devise workable desegregation plans." In monitoring the performance of Title IV recipients, the Commission recommended that the Office of Education withhold further contract payments and use fund recovery mechanisms to force unwilling recipients to participate in the preparation of school desegregation plans and to testify in desegregation litigation.

The Office of Education has acknowledged a number of the criticisms of program administration that were made in the Commission report and earlier reports. In an effort to concentrate program funds on those projects which evidence the greatest potential for facilitating school desegregation, new grant application procedures for FY 73 required applications for grants for State Title IV centers and general assistance centers to provide evidence of requests from school districts for technical assistance and/or training related to desegregation problems. Appropriate staffing in Title IV projects is now encouraged through application ratings which give more credit to proposals whose staff are experienced in desegregation assistance and representative in racial or ethnic composition of the population to be served. Also, the new guidelines require school district grantees to employ an experienced advisory specialist who will have direct and frequent access to the district superintendent. Although applications also will receive favorable ratings for having organized plans for self-evaluation, the Commission report's specific recommendation for independent evaluations of all Title IV projects has not been implemented.

The Office of Education responded to the Commission report's criticism of the policy of forbidding Title IV recipients from responding to court requests for assistance by stressing that the program legislation only allows technical assistance to be provided upon the request of a school district and that previous assistance to courts had been provided in the absence of clarification of the legislation. It also said that public and private institutions of higher education must receive equal and fair consideration in funding decisions and that contractual obligations of Title IV recipients have been enforced, resulting in termination of two State Education Agency contracts in FY 72.

Ongoing and Planning Evaluation Studies:

A formal evaluation is planned to be initiated in FY 74.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. DHEW, Equal Educational Opportunities, Washington, D. C. 1970 (OE-38017).

2. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Title IV and School Desegregation: A Study of a Neglected Federal Program Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, January 1973.

3. Race Relations Information Center, Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act: A Program in Search of a Policy, Nashville, Tenn., 1970.

4. Washington Research Project, University Title IV Centers, 1971 (Unpublished).

5. DHEW, Review of the Set of Findings Developed by the Education Coalition Concerning the Programs and Operations of the University Title IV Centers, (Unpublished), 1971.

B. Education for the Handicapped Programs

1. State Grant Program
2. Aid to States for Education of Handicapped Children in State Operated Schools
3. Regional Resource Centers
4. Deaf/Blind Centers
5. Early Childhood Education
6. Special Education Manpower Development
7. Recruitment and Information
8. Innovation and Development
9. Media Services and Captioned Films
10. Specific Learning Disabilities

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

State Grant Program

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part B
Assistance to States for Education
of Handicapped Children

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973 [1]

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1967	$51,500,000	$ 2,475,000
	1968	154,500,000	15,000,000
	1969	167,375,000	29,250,000
	1970	206,000,000	29,190,000
	1971	206,000,000	34,000,000
	1972	216,300,000	37,499,000
	1973	226,600,000	50,000,000 [2]
	1974		47,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Non-matching grants to the States are made to assist in the initiation, expansion, and improvement of education of handicapped children at the pre-school, elementary, and secondary levels. Funds are allocated to the States in proportion to the States' populations in the age range of 3 to 21 (minimum allocation of $200,000). Up to 5% or $100,000 of the State grant may be used for administration of educational programs for the handicapped by State Education Agencies.

Seven million children (one million of pre-school age) are estimated to be handicapped by mental retardation, speech problems, emotional disorders, deafness, blindness, crippling conditions or other health impairments that can be expected to cause school failure, emotional problems and retarded development unless special educational procedures are available to them. At present, it is estimated that only 40% of school age children are receiving special education, and in some States only 10-15% of the children are receiving this help. Approximately one million of these unserved children are totally excluded from any educational programming.

---

[1] During 1974 the program is operating under the one-year extension provided by Sec. 413 of the General Education Provisions Act; extension legislation is pending.

[2] Of this amount, only $37,500,000 was obligated in FY 73; the additional $12,500,000 are currently under litigation.

The Federal strategy for the development of the program has been to serve as a catalyst to local and State program growth rather than providing full Federal support for a limited number of children. Joint planning with the States has led to increased programming for children on a comprehensive basis involving various Federal programs and local resources, e.g., the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Titles I and III, Vocational Education Act, etc.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In 1973, approximately 2,000 projects were supported by Title VI-B funds; of these, about one-third were new projects. More then 200,000 children participated directly in Federally supported projects under this program.

Program monitoring information indicates that the program helped to stimulate educational opportunities, supported by non-Federal funds, for an additional 200,000 handicapped children in 1973 by providing developmental and technical assistance to twenty-five States (in a continuing program); States were assisted in designing new programs, coordinating Federal and State funding, and developing strategies for increasing services to handicapped children. A number of States modified their statutes to allow for services to children following models of Federal programming.

A formal evaluation of the State-grant program indicated that EHA-B has contributed to the expansion of State services, programs and mandates for serving handicapped children. The most effective component appeared to be the administrative set-aside of EHA-B which increased capability for planning programs at the SEA level. Less effective was the project component of EHA-B; although project grants permitted local districts to develop innovative programs which would not otherwise occur, the impact of that innovation was largely restricted to the particular district which received the grant. There was not a significant replication impact in other districts which did not receive EHA-B funds.

The study hypothesized that the failure of EHA-B to produce a multiplier effect could be traced to the nature of fiscal support provided by the EHA legislation. The certainty of receiving a continuing and "non-matching" federal grant lessens the probability that local districts will undertake such projects on their own. Consequently, EHA has little effect on changing local priorities in the allocation of non-federal resources.

A second problem identified is that the EHA-B capita formula does not take into account the marked differences among States and local governments in their ability to pay for programs for handicapped children. Thus, the formula does not correct the existing situation whereby a child's chance of receiving appropriate services depends largely on where his family lives.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau od Education for the Handicapped

Evaluation of an Aid-to-States Program for Education of Handicapped Children, by Exotech Systems, Inc. (completed January 1974).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Aid to States for Education of Handicapped Children in State-Operated and State-supported Schools

Legislation:

ESEA Title I, Section 103(a)(5), commonly known as P.L. 89-313

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973 [1]

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION[2]	APPROPRIATION
	1966		$15,900,000
	1967		15,100,000
	1968		24,700,000
	1969		29,700,000
	1970		37,500,000
	1971		46,100,000
	1972		56,400,000
	1973		75,962,098
	1974		85,777,779

Program Purpose and Operation:

The program provides federal assistance to State-operated and State-supported schools and for other institutions for handicapped children to support educational programs. Institutions which qualify for participation range from those which provide full-year residential programs to those which provide special itinerant services on a part-day basis for handicapped children enrolled in regular day schools or who may be confined to their homes because of severe handicapping conditions. In each instance, a substantial part of the educational costs are borne by a State agency (SA) rather than a local agency. Participating institutions serve one or more categories of handicapped children, including mentally retarded, hard-of-hearing, deaf, speech-impaired, visually impaired, seriously emotionally disturbed, and crippled or other health impaired children.

Federal funds under this program are determined by a formula which specifies that, for each handicapped child in average daily attendance (ADA) in an elementary or secondary educational program operated or supported by a State agency, the SA receives an amount equal to half the State expenditure for a child enrolled in its public schools, or half of the National average, whichever is higher.

---

[1] During 1974 the program is operating under the one-year extension provided by Sec. 413 of the GEPA.

[2] The Authorization level under this legislation is determined by formula and taken from the total Title I appropriation prior to any other allocation of Title I funds. See text for definition of the formula.

At the Federal level, organizational responsibility for this program is vested in the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH). Allocations under the program, as determined by BEH, are issued to State agencies. Applications for the project funds are then submitted by participating institutions to their supervising State agency. The SA reviews the applications, and forwards those which it approves to the State educational agency (SEA) for final approval and the release of funds. The participating institution is required to submit end-of-project reports to its SA to account for the expenditure of funds and to provide an evaluation of project activities.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 1973, approximately $76 million were allocated to 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and Guam. Allocations to States ranged from a low of $99,746 for Nevada, based on its reported average daily attendance of handicapped children, to $9,337,521 for New York.

The funds allocated were administered by 141 State agencies which supervised project participation at 3,082 schools for handicapped children. The average daily attendance reported by these institutions was 157,997 children for the school year 1970-71, the attendance year data used in establishing the FY 1973 allocations. Those children benefiting under the program are distributed across the following handicap categories approximately as follows: Mentally Retarded-58.7%; Deaf and Hard of Hearing-16.3%; Emotionally Disturbed-12.5%; Crippled and Other Heath Impaired-6.5%; Visually Handicapped-6.0%.

Data on the impact of P.L. 89-313 funds will be provided by the evaluation study described below.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An impact evaluation of this program is currently underway in a sample of 25 States and approximately 900 institutions. The objectives of this study are (a) to assess the impact of the program and (b) to determine if the impact can be increased.

The Phase I report of the evaluation has been completed, and provides a summary of existing data on the target population and beneficiaries of P.L. 89-313. Statistical data are presented generally for the years 1966-73, and were gathered from a variety of published and unpublished records. The report indicates quantitative change in the program, including shifts in the relative allocations for various handicapping conditions, trends in ADA rates by State and region, and changes in enrollment figures by types of program since 1966.

In addition, the report discusses problems of inconsistent prevalence estimates, and of the present grant formula which perpetuates the extreme variability among States in the volume of services provided. Calculations of the effect of a revenue sharing formula on P.L. 89-313 allocations are provided, by State. Actual impact on schools will be measured in Phase II.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
2. Evaluation of Educational Programs in State-operated and State-supported Schools for Handicapped Children by Exotech Systems, Inc. (estimated completion date: Fall, 1974)

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Regional Resource Centers

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C- Centers and Services to Meet Special Needs of the Handicapped, Sec. 621	June 30, 1973 1/

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968	$7,750,000	
	1969	7,750,000	$5,500,000
	1970	10,000,000	1,800,000
	1971*		3,550,000
	1972*		3,550,000
	1973*		6,226,000
	1974		7,243,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants and contracts to institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, or nonprofit private organizations, to establish and operate regional centers. The purpose of these centers is to increase the development and application of diagnostic and educational programs for handicapped children. The Centers use demonstrations, dissemination, training, financial assistance, staff expertise, and direct services as strategies for carrying out their assistance role. Among major activities of the Centers are:

1. Identification of unserved handicapped children;
2. Measurement and diagnosis of handicapped children for the purpose of proper educational placement;
3. Development of educational and vocational programs for handicapped children;

1/ During FY 74 the program is operating under the one-year extension provided by Sec. 413 of GEPA.

* Totals of $36,500,000 in 1971, $51,500,000 in 1972, and $66,500,000 in 1973, are authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

4. Provision of technical assistance to relevant personnel, including teachers and parents, in implementing appropriate services for the handicapped learner;

5. Periodic re-examination, re-prescription or case-tracking to validate appropriateness of program placement for children.

In 1974, the RRC program will also provide special target grants to assist States, local agencies and consortiums in assessing and meeting urgent needs concerning the severely handicapped (e.g. those resulting from recent court mandates to serve all handicapped children within a State).

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

During FY 1973, approximately 40,000 handicapped children received comprehensive services (diagnostic, prescriptive, remedial or other supportive services) which were coordinated through the six regional centers.

Bureau review and analysis of the RRC's indicated that there needed to be stronger coordination among RRC's and the Instructional Materials Centers. There were gaps or duplications in service in some regions covered by both RRC and IMC networks. Therefore, in FY 74, both types of centers will be funded through competitive contract awards, and the resulting "Learning Resource Center" network will have eliminated the less fruitful strategies or models for service in both areas.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Deaf-Blind Centers

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C-
Centers and Services to Meet Special
Needs of the Handicapped, Sec. 622

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973 [1]

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1968	$3,000,000	
	1969	3,000,000	$1,000,000
	1970	7,000,000	2,000,000
	1971*		4,500,000
	1972*		7,500,000
	1973*		15,795,000
	1974*		14,055,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides for grants or contracts to public and nonprofit private organizations to establish and operate centers for educational and diagnostic services for deaf-blind children. The centers also initiate whatever ancillary services are necessary to assure that these children can achieve their full potential, and meaningful participation in society.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

The Deaf-Blind program, through its 10 regional centers, developed more than 100 programs and projects with the support of Federal funds. These programs and projects have coordinated the following resources and services for deaf-blind children and their families: educational services for 1800 children (residential and day school); crisis care services for 200 children and their parents; diagnostic and educational assessment for 500 children; parent counseling services for parents of 1244 children, and inservice training for 4500 educators, professionals, and parents. The program is aimed at an estimated target population of 5,064 deaf-blind children.

---

[1] During 1974 the program is operating under the one-year extension provided by Sec. 413 of GEPA.

* Totals of $36,500,000 in 1971, $51,500,000 in 1972, and $66,500,000 in 1973, are authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

Program monitoring information indicates that the Centers have been successful in terms of reaching increasing numbers of deaf-blind children. Currently the program serves approximately 46% (N=2,346) of the estimated total target population of 5,064 children, coordinating appropriate services among 123 local and State agencies. This represents rapid growth from the 1969-70 school year, when coordination existed among only 6 agencies, and 100 children were served.

Despite this evidence of growth, considerable regional variation exists in amount and quality of service provided. The Bureau is currently reviewing the centers in preparation for establishing basic minimum standards of service for the entire program.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A formal assessment of the resources available for severely handicapped children is directly related to this program. The study will evaluate adequacy of services for a national sample of 100 programs and institutions which provide services to deaf-blind, severely mentally retarded, severely emotionally disturbed, and multiply handicapped children and youth. The study will be completed in November, 1974.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Assessment of Available Resources for Services to Severely Handicapped Children, Abt Associates, Inc. (estimated completion date: November, 1974)

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Early Childhood Education

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C- Centers and Services to Meet Special Needs of the Handicapped, Sec. 623	June 30, 1973 1/

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1969	$1,000,000	$ 945,000
	1970	10,000,000	3,000,000
	1971*		7,000,000
	1972*		7,500,000
	1973*		17,739,000
	1974		12,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants and contracts on a matching basis (90% Federal: 10% Local) to stimulate the development of comprehensive educational services for young (0-8 years) handicapped children with a primary focus on the preschool age level (0-5) years. The objective is to encourage growth of early childhood services for all pre-school aged handicapped children in Federal, State, and local educational and day care programs to prevent and reduce the debilitating effects of a handicap upon the children. Between 50% and 75% of these children fall into the categories of mild retardation, emotional disturbance, and of children who, with early childhood programming, would have an excellent chance of overcoming their handicaps by developing compensatory skills so that they can attend regular classes.

The funded projects are three-tiered, with operational, demonstration, and outreach phases. The federal strategy through outreach is to gain replication of successful demonstrations at the local and state level.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 1973, the program supported 70 operational and 17 outreach projects, which provided direct services to approximately 4,589 children. Through

---

1/ During 1974 the program is operating under the one-year extension provided by Sec. 413 of the GEPA.

* Totals of $36,500,000 in 1971, $51,500,000 in 1972, and $66,500,000 in 1973, are authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

replications of model projects and outreach activities, an additional 17,499 children were served. Training and other supportive services were provided to 9,164 parents, 2,420 Head Start staff members, 4,369 public school educators, and 7,000 day care and nursery school staff and volunteers. In addition, diagnostic/screening services were provided to 11,692 handicapped children.

This program has also supported workshops and other technical assistance activities through its Technical Assistance Development System (TADS), and funds segments of the Mister Roger's Neighborhood television program which discuss acceptance of handicapping conditions among preschoolers.

Program monitoring information, based on FY 73 reports sent to BEH by the projects themselves, indicate the following measures of effectiveness:

657 children graduated to other programs which previously would not accept them;

513 children were placed in special education classes;

886 children progressed sufficiently to be approved for enrollment in regular kindergarten or day care programs;

214 projects replicated complete models of early childhood programs;

280 projects replicated components of model programs.

The implications of these data are that the program has been effective in increasing services provided to young handicapped children.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A formal evaluation study began in September, 1973, and will be completed in the fall of 1975. It will assess children's performance, project services and costs for a sample of third and fourth year projects.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Evaluation of the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program, Battelle Memorial Institute. (estimated completion date: Fall, 1975)

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Education Manpower Development

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part D - Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 631-2 and Sec. 634	June 30, 1973 [1]

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965	$14,500,000	$14,500,000
	1966	19,500,000	19,500,000
	1967	29,500,000	24,500,000
	1968	34,000,000	24,500,000
	1969	37,500,000	29,700,000
	1970	55,000,000	29,700,000
	1971*		31,900,000
	1972*		34,406,000
	1973*		41,351,000
	1974		39,615,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides for grants to institutions of higher education, State education agencies, and other non-profit agencies to prepare teachers, supervisors, teacher educators, researchers, speech correctionists and other special service personnel to educate the handicapped. To extend quality educational service to all handicapped children under current teacher-student ratios and current patterns of instructional organization will require an additional 245,000 teachers for school age children and 60,000 for preschool children. Upgrading and updating the skills of the 240,000 special education teachers currently employed, of whom nearly one-half are uncertified, is also necessary.

This program attacks the problem by use of Federal grants to increase the number of teachers trained, by development of new models for improved effectiveness, and by targeting resources on crucial areas of need.

---

[1] During FY 74 the program is operating under the one-year extension provided by Sec. 413 of the GEPA.

* A total of $69,500,000 in 1971, $87,000,000 in 1972, and $103,500,000 in 1973, is authorized for Parts D, EHA.

In FY 1972, all grantees received a general "block" grant rather than a grant based on a fixed number of student stipends, as in preceding years. This gave grantees more flexibility in their allocation of funds, by enabling them to increase support of faculty salaries and curriculum development in addition to traditional student financial assistance. This strategy was intended to have a multiplier effect, by upgrading personnel preparation programs with a limited investment of federal funds.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

During FY 73, approximately 19,149 students received direct financial support from this program; the Bureau estimates that approximately 35,000 additional students also benefited from some training as a result of "block" grant support received by university departments.

A total of 519 grants was awarded: 382 program assistance grants to universities, 56 to state education agencies, 31 grants targeted to physical education and recreation training programs, and 50 special project grants for development and demonstration of new teaching models and techniques.

At the presently (data collected in FY 72) low level of service (40% of handicapped children served), special education teacher production is just keeping up with the demand created by attrition in the field and the need to fill open slots. That is, the demand annually for approximately 20,000 new teachers is roughly the same as the number of special education graduates produced each year. However, as efforts increase on the part of States to raise the extent or quality of services to the handicapped, this program may not be able to fill the demand for new personnel.

A formal evaluation of the Manpower Development program was conducted during 1971-72. The data suggested that Title VI-D support was an important factor in attracting and/or retaining about one-third of the student grantees in special education. For the remaining grantees, the financial support tended to facilitate a commitment which had already been made, i.e., it enabled them to receive their degrees sooner, or to obtain certification in a specialty area. There was no significant difference in the retention rates of special education teachers who had received VI-D grants as students and those who had not.

The data also indicated that recipients of Title VI-D grants were not distributed among specialty areas.in proportion to need estimates. Students tended to be overrepresented in the field of sensory disorders and under-represented in the field of learning disorders. Students were also unevenly distributed with regard to race and sex: they tended to be predominantly white (96%) and female (78%), with males clustering at the higher levels of graduate study.

The evaluation study recommended a heavier investment in SEA programs to retrain regular classroom teachers and those special education teachers needing certification. Strategies for improving the distribution of students along dimensions of race, sex and specialty area were also recommended.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Source of Evaluation Data:

An Evaluation of Federal Programs to Increase the Pool of Special Education Teachers; RMC Research Corporation (1973).

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Recruitment and Information

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part D - Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 633	June 30, 1973 1/

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968	$1,000,000	
	1969	1,000,000	$ 250,000
	1970	1,000,000	475,000
	1971*		500,000
	1972*		500,000
	1973*		664,000
	1974		500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides for non-matching grants or contracts to maintain appropriate information and referral services for parents and their handicapped children, in order that they may be assisted in their attempts to obtain diagnostic and educational services. In addition, the program supports projects to interest people in the career field of special education.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 1973, a referral system was established in approximately 100 cities. The referral centers, operating through Health and Welfare Councils, are designed to assist parents and other persons in obtaining services and placements for handicapped children. Regional television and radio campaigns were undertaken in concert with other HEW activities concerning the handicapped in an effort to coordinate information systems across States.

In addition, the Special Education Information Center (SEIC) maintained a computerized national directory of existing special education programs and

---

1/ During FY 74 the program is operating under the one-year extension provided
Sec. 413 of the GEPA.

* A total of $69,500,000 in 1971, $87,000,000 in 1972, and $103,500,000 in 19
is authorized for Part D, EHA.

facilities, and disseminated related information through its newsletters to approximately 100,000 parents and educators.

The Special Education Information Center solicits and receives substantial feedback from parents who have received referral services or information through newsletters. On the basis of this information, the service provided by SEIC appears to be successfully meeting a very great need for information on where and how to obtain programs for handicapped children.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Innovation and Development

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part E- Research in the Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 641 & Sec. 642	June 30, 1973 1/

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
	1966	6,000,000	8,000,000
	1967	9,000,000	8,100,000
	1968	12,000,000	11,100,000
	1969	14,000,000	12,800,000
	1970	18,000,000	12,060,000
	1971	27,000,000	15,000,000
	1972	35,500,000	11,176,000
	1973	45,000,000	9,916,000
	1974		9,916,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program addresses the improvement of educational opportunities for handicapped children through support of decision-oriented knowledge production and utilization. This support includes contracts for research, development, diffusion and adoption activities. Activities are integrated in a planned pattern to support teacher training and the special service functions of the total Federal program for handicapped children. The innovation and development activity attempts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the educational system and its provisions for handicapped children: by supporting the development and validation of new service models; by packaging that information in usable form; and by systematically assuring that this information is placed in appropriate hands.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

During FY 1973, 68 projects were supported; of these, 35 were continuations of projects begun in previous years, and 33 were new efforts. Approximately

---

1/ During FY 74 the program is operating under the one-year extension provided by Sec. 413 of the GEPA.

53% of the total funds available were used to support research activities, and the remaining 47% used to support demonstration and development efforts.

Examples of the types of activities supported during FY 73 follow:

(1) Developed and tested a curriculum for social learning in 200 classes for educable mentally retarded children;

(2) Supported three model demonstration programs in the area of postsecondary school vocational training for hearing impaired youth. These projects have now been replicated in over twenty community colleges across the country;

(3) Developed teacher training techniques and instructional materials using applied behavior modification techniques;

(4) Produced a computer assisted course of instruction designed to familiarize regular classroom teachers with skills for the identification and diagnosis of handicapped children in their classrooms. This course was field tested with 181 teachers in Pennsylvania, and is now operational on a regular basis with approximately 3,500 teachers in six States.

(5) With the cooperation of the Texas Education Agency, directed a major evaluation of that State's integrated programming policy for handicapped children.

In the past, the Innovation and Development program has been criticized for its lack of clearly defined program goals and objectives, and its selection of particular research projects for funding. However, several changes in funding strategy planned in FY 73 have been implemented in FY 74, in order to improve the effectiveness of the program. Research funds not previously committed for continuation costs will be targeted on specific projects solicited by RFP's and a specific grant announcement. Projects on both a contract and grant basis will be selected systematically to fill gaps in the knowledge base. The new targeted program reflects a reassessment and prioritization of research issues, based on advice from professionals and constituent groups obtained through conferences and panel meetings.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

None

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Media Services and Captioned Films

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part F - Instructional Media for the Handicapped, Sec. 652 and 653	Indefinite

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		$1,384,000
	1966		2,800,000
	1967	$3,000,000	2,800,000
	1968	8,000,000	2,800,000
	1969	8,000,000	4,750,000
	1970	10,000,000	4,750,000
	1971	12,500,000	6,000,000
	1972	15,000,000	10,478,000
	1973	20,000,000	12,968,000
	1974		13,000,000(estima

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides the handicapped learner with specific educational materials to make it possible for him (her) to be educated effectively. This purpose is being advanced through the operation of a National Center for Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, and a network of Special Education Instructional Materials Centers and Regional Media Centers for the Deaf. An equally important mission is the original Congressional mandate: to promote the general welfare of deaf persons by captioning and distributing motion picture films which play an important role in their advancement on both a general cultural and an educational basis. In both cases the purpose of this program is to provide for maximum access to learning experiences by handicapped children through the development and efficient management of both material and human resources.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

During FY 1973, the national network provided materials and techniques for educating handicapped children through 13 Instructional Materials Centers, 4 Media Centers for the Deaf, and over 300 State and local "associate centers" established with the assistance of the national network.

In addition, films distributed to schools and classes for the deaf reached an audience of 2,750,000 people.

Reliable data on the impact of IMC/RMC centers on the education of handicapped children are not available. However, program management information has been collected.

Annual program reviews of the IMC/RMC network by the Bureau indicated that several network functions had overlapped among the various individual centers (e.g. computer retrieval of materials). Furthermore, these centers did not always have clearly defined spheres of responsibility apart from the Regional Resource Centers funded under Title VI-Part C. To make more efficient use of the total network resources, and to centralize the several network functions which had previously overlapped, the Congress authorized under Sec. 653 EHA and Bureau established a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped.
With regard to the film distribution services, the Bureau has obtained limited cost-effectiveness data. They show that the search for new and more economical measures of film delivery has lowered the cost per viewer to 12 cents, and more efficient distribution methods have expanded the average showings per print per year by 33% to 18 showings. Plans are underway to supply training films and other educational media on a no-cost basis to teachers of all handicapped children.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Edcuation for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Specific Learning Disabilities

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part G - Special Programs for Children With Specific Learning Disabilities	June 30, 1973 [1]

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969		
	1970	$12,000,000	$ 1,000,000
	1971	20,000,000	1,000,000
	1972	31,000,000	2,250,000
	1973	31,000,000	2,750,000
	1974		3,250,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to stimulate State and local provision of comprehensive identification, diagnostic, prescriptive and educational services for all children with specific learning disabilities (1 to 3 percent of the school-aged population) through the funding of model programs, and supportive technical assistance, research, and training activities. Competitive grants or contracts for this purpose are made to public and nonprofit organizations.

Program Scope:

In 1973, the program established and maintained model projects in 43 States with the intention of encouraging these States to develop and implement a plan for serving all of the learning disabled children within their boundaries. Each project has as program components: a model learning disabilities program, an evaluation of the program's objectives and goals, a determination of the validity of the model and a statewide plan for implementation of that model. These program components are supported by technical and developmental assistance Approximately 4,000 children participated in these programs.

---

[1] During FY 74 the program is operating under the one-year extension provided by Sec. 413 of GEPA.

Program Effectiveness:

There is relatively little validated information on the impact of this program, particularly on the effectiveness of its intended "multiplier" effect at the State level.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

C. Vocational and Adult Education Programs

1. Vocational and Technical Education: Basic Grants to States
2. Vocational and Technical Education: Programs for Students with Special Needs
3. Vocational and Technical Education: Research and Training
4. Vocational and Technical Education: Exemplary Programs:
5. Vocational and Technical Education: Consumer and Homemaking Education
6. Vocational and Technical Education: Cooperative Education Programs
7. Vocational and Technical Education: Work Study Programs
8. Vocational and Technical Education: Curriculum Development
9. Adult Basic Education: Basic Grants to States
10. Adult Basic Education: Special Projects
11. Adult Basic Education: Teacher Training
12. Manpower Development and Training Programs

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Basic Grants to States

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended 1968, Part B	Permanent

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION*
	1965	$156,641,000	$156,446,000
	1966	209,741,000	209,741,000
	1967	252,491,000	248,216,000
	1968	252,491,000	249,300,000
	1969	314,500,000	248,216,000
	1970	503,500,000	300,336,000
	1971	602,500,000	315,302,000
	1972	602,500,000	376,682,000
	1973	508,500,000	376,682,000
	1974	508,500,000	405,347,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are made to the States to assist them in conducting vocational education programs for persons of all ages with the objective of insuring that education and training programs of vocational education are available to all individuals who desire and need such education and training for gainful employment. States are required to set aside 15 percent for vocational education for the disadvantaged; 15 percent for post-secondary programs; and 10 percent for vocational education for the handicapped. Funds may be used for the construction of area vocational education facilities. States are required to match one dollar for every Federal dollar.

Under the provisions of P.L. 92-318, the definition of vocational and technical education has been expanded to include industrial arts education and the training of volunteer firemen.

---

* This does not include the permanent authorization and appropriation of $7.1 million apportioned to the States each year under the Smith-Hughes Act.

Program Scope:

According to FY 1972 reports, 11,602,144 students were enrolled in vocational education programs. Of these 1,608,871 were enrolled through grade eight; 5,622,77, grades 9-12; 1,304,092, postsecondary. Adult enrollees were classified as 546,193, preparatory; 2,347,870 supplemental, and 172,341 apprenticeship.

The following chart illustrates vocational enrollment trends:

	1965	1972	1977 1/
Secondary	2,819,000	7,231,648	10,416,000
Postsecondary	207,000	1,304,092	2,710,000
Adult	2,379,000	3,066,404	4,168,000
Total enrollment	5,431,000	11,602,144	17,294,000
Disadvantaged	NA	1,616,621	2,322,000
Handicapped	NA	221,342	380,000

1/ Based on State report estimates.

Construction of Facilities FY '72

In fiscal year 1972, Federal, State, and local funds totaling over $265.2 million were committed for 436 construction projects. This increased the number of vocational schools from 405 in 1965 to 1889 in 1972. During 1965 through 1972 over 1.9 billion dollars of Federal, State, and local funds have been spent in 2641 projects to increase the capacity of area vocational schools through expansion, remodeling, and new construction. This has resulted in an estimated increase of 665,000 training stations.

Federal funds from three legislative sources are largely responsible for this increase in the number and quality of area vocational schools. The funds approved for expenditures this year are:

	Funds Approved (Millions) 1972
Vocational Education Act (1963 and 1968 Amendments)	55.7
Appalachian Regional Commission (1965)	27.8
Economic Development Act (1965)	6.7
State and local funds	175.0
TOTAL	265.2

A breakdown of funding by source of funds for fiscal year 1965 through 1972 is:

	Funds Approved (Millions) 1965-1972
Vocational Education Act (1963 and 1968 Amendments)	435.2
Appalachian Regional Commission (1965)	163.1
Economic Development Act (1965)	72.3
State and local funds	1,262.8
TOTAL	1,933.4

Program data at the Federal levelare generally limited to enrollment and expenditure data from required State plans and annual reports submitted by State education agencies. They are often incomplete. GAO and program monitoring reports document the difficulties of the data. There is no established procedure for the development of response material for specific data requirements which are not included in the basic reporting system. Data are being collected by NCES through studies such as "Survey of Vocational Education Student and Teacher Characteristics in Public Schools, 1972."

Program Effectiveness:

Evaluation data indicate that participation in vocational education programs do increase earnings; however more information is needed about the characteristics of vocational education students, their performance and attitudes after they leave the program. Base year data from the National Longitudinal study of the class of 1972 and analyses of data from other studies such as NCES surveys are providing additional insights into these questions.

National Longitudinal Study of the Class of 1972:

A major source for outcome data, the study has a nationally representative sample of about 16,400 high school seniors in 1,200 schools, both public and private. Of these, about 3500 are vocational students.

Preliminary data from the base yearare now available and further analysis of data for vocational students is also in process as described in the section on planned and ongoing studies.

Some of the findings from the base year include:

> While the majority of seniors rated their schools as excellent or good with regard to reputation, facilities and quality of instruction and counseling, only 29 percent of those expressing an opinion gave their schools high marks in job placement of graduates.
>
> Almost 90 percent of all seniors felt their schools have provided more help for students having trouble with such subjects as reading and math. At least two-thirds of those expressing an opinion thought their schools should have placed more emphasis on vocational and technical programs, should have offered more practical work experience and should help students find jobs when they leave school.
>
> Fifty percent of the students planned to go to college the year after high school and another 9 percent planned to attend a trade or business school. Examination of the data on the vocational student sample indicated the following plans:
>
> 46.4 percent would work full time
> 3.8 percent would enter apprenticeship or on-the-job training
> 15.2 percent would attend a trade or business school
> 5.3 percent would take academic courses at a junior or community college
> 5.8 percent would take technical/vocational courses at a junior or community college
> 6.6 percent would attend a four-year university
> 16.8 percent had other plans (i.e. enter military

service, be a homemaker, work part-time
without attending school or travel)

Second interviews will be conducted with these students in 1974.

Project Metro: Effectiveness Evaluation Data for Major City Secondary Educational Systems, Class of 1970 Follow-Up Survey Vocational Program Graduates

This study is a follow-up survey of 35,000 vocational and 55,000 non-vocational graduates from all secondary schools in 22 Project Metro cities. For Project Metro study purposes, a major city is defined as one with a population of 250,000 or more.

The significant findings of this study are summarized as follows:

1. Choice of vocational course. About 22 percent of the graduates reported that they did not get the vocational course of their preferred first choice.

2. Vocational course selection. About 67 percent of the graduates reported a non-school source as the most important source of influence upon vocational course selection.

3. Occupational Information prior selection. About 36 percent of the students reported that their knowledge of the occupation selected for study was poor or fair at the time they selected their vocational course.

4. Plans to work in the field of study. Only 39 percent of the graduates reported that, at the time of vocational course selection, they definitely planned to work in the occupation studied after completion of high school.

5. Disposition after high school. Only about 54 percent were available for full-time employment. The rest were in college, school, military service or not available for work for personal reasons. Of those available for work, about 71 percent were employed full-time, 7 percent were employed part-time, and 22 percent were unemployed and looking for full-time work. In total, 38 percent of the Class of '70 respondents were employed full-time and not attending college or school.

6. Stability with first employer. About 28 percent of those employed full-time were no longer with their first full-time job employer within six months after graduation.

7. Time required to get the first job. Of those employed full-time, about 27 percent had their job lined up upon graduation. Within a month, 73 percent were employed full-time. About 27 percent required more than a month to find their first job.

8. Methods used to obtain the first job. Only 22 percent of the graduates credited school sources with helping them find their first jobs. A greater percentage (25%) reported that they found their jobs on their own without anyone's help.

9. Employment in field for which trained. Of those employed full-time, only 45 percent were employed in the field for which trained. Based upon total graduate output, that 45 percent is 16.3 percent of all Class of '70 graduates.

10. Employment out of the field for which trained. Of the 55 percent that were employed out of the field for which trained about 85 percent were employed in unskilled or semi-skilled jobs that could have been held without the benefit of vocational education.

11. Preparation for employment in the field. Of those employed in the field, a 95 percent reported that their occupational training had been either excellent or good preparation for their present employment.

12. Reasons for not getting job in field of study. Of those employed out of the field, about 20 percent reported that they could not find a job in the field, about 14 percent reported that they did not feel qualified and about 66 percent reported that they did not want work in their field of study for various reasons.

13. Hourly earnings of vocational graduates. Of those employed full-time, the mean hourly earnings were $2.35 per hour. Those employed in the field for which trained earn more 5 to 15 cents per hour more than those employed out of their field.

14. Present location of graduates. About 88 percent of all vocational graduates still reside in the same city in which they attended high school. Of those employed full-time, about 95 percent are still in the same city.

Practical Career Guidance, Counseling, and Placement for the Non-College-Bound Student:

This study reviewed data concerned with the practical career guidance and counseling for noncollege-bound students. The report's findings indicate that women, minority, and disadvantaged students have not obtained sufficient occupational information and assistance in relating their abilities and interests to career options. Furthermore, the overall conclusion drawn was that the functions of guidance and counseling personnel generally have not been aligned to provide practical career guidance for noncollege-bound students despite national priorities and allocations of funds. Recognizing the need for realignment of the counseling services for the noncollege-bound, the report recommends that 1) guidance and counseling experts provide more specific information and 2) realignment be based on a planning model that includes assessment of the priority of target groups, selection of appropriate strategies, and evaluation of efforts.

A Comparative Study of Proprietary and Non-Proprietary Vocational Training Program:

A study of 51 proprietary and 14 non-proprietary schools in four cities examined student outcomes in four occupational areas; office, health, computer and technical occupations. About 7,000 students and 5,200 alumni were queried.

Findings indicate that 78 percent of the graduates sought training related jobs and three-quarters of these persons found training-related jobs. However, less than 20% of the proprietary alumni and only 13% of the non-proprietary alumni obtained jobs through school placement service, a surprising result especially for proprietary schools, since virtually all offer placement assistance. Most graduates indicated satisfaction with their current job status. Of those alumni currently employed, about 34% of the proprietary and 12% of the non-proprietary group felt that the training was definitely not worth the money.

Cost benefit measures indicate that the investment in vocational training was well worthwhile for all occupational groups except the computer trainees in proprietary schools. Non-proprietary school graduates have an advantage over proprietary school graduates in cost-benefit measures and in salary gain from before training to the first job in training. However, non-proprietary alumni overall earned less before training than proprietary graduates. Proprietary and non-proprietary schools differ substantially in their operations and program offerings; however, the student enrolled in both types of schools are very similar in terms of backgrounds and motivational characteristics. Most are young high school graduates enrolled in full-time programs with a goal of obtaining full-time jobs. A sizeable proportion of the students (30% proprietary and, 42% non-proprietary) belong to minority ethnic groups. Accredited schools and chain schools surveyed are no more effective in placing graduates than non-accredited and non-chain schools. Cities surveyed include: Chicago, Illinois; Atlanta, Georgia; San Francisco, California; and Rochester, New York.

Vocational Education Impact Study:

Findings from the Vocational Impact Study, a three-part study completed in 1972, provides detailed analyses of available data from recent studies of vocational students, data examining the impact of the 1968 amendments and information about the duplication, gaps and coordination of publicly funded skill training programs in 20 cities.

Analysis of Recent Studies:

Of all studies analyzed, the National Longitudinal surveys (also called the Parnes study) provides the most recent and probably the most reliable data about vocational education. The Parnes study confirms that enrollees of vocational programs do benefit from vocational training and suggests that the influence of vocational education on earnings is more closely related to changes in labor market conditions than had been thought to be the case before.

Another study, a case study of three cities, shows that high school graduates from vocational curriculum in the instances surveyed experienced 5 to 10 percentage points more time employed during the six-year follow-up period than was the case with the graduates of the academic curriculum who did not attend college.

Impact of 1968 Amendments:

For disadvantaged and handicapped populations, there appears to be no relationship between the degree to which a State expended Federal set-aside funds and the investment of State/local funds for these target groups. Data indicate that these were low priority areas in some States and while most States have a formula for establishing priorities, some did not fully expend the Federal set-asides for these groups, the Vocational Impact Study reports.

However, data indicates that post-secondary programs have a high priority in most States and matching ratios also indicate a much greater State/local effort in this category than required by law. The most rapid growth in vocational enrollments in the past five years has taken place in the post-secondary programs.

A Study of Duplication, Gaps and Coordination of Publicly Funded Skill in Training Programs in 20 Cities:

Data on more than 390,000 enrollees in 20 cities indicate that 65% were enrolled in secondary vocational education programs. Of the remaining 35 percent who participated in Federal manpower programs, over two-thirds were enrolled in occupational programs in post-secondary institutions. Analysis of enrollee characteristics data indicate that vocational programs and manpower programs serve different populations. Most manpower enrollees are those over 18 years of age with 6th to 10th grade level of educational attainment. Such enrollees rarely find a place in postsecondary institutions which usually have some form of restriction on entering skills training programs even where there is a policy of open admissions, the report concludes.

Several manpower programs, notably Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, offer skill training to the high school age group normally served by secondary vocational programs. Accounting for only two-percent of the secondary school-aged students enrolled in skill training, these programs are primarily for dropouts. They offer the same occupational skills which are available in the better public secondary programs, although the manpower programs offer considerably more service in terms of guidance, remedial education, placement and job coaching.

Planned and Ongoing Studies:

An Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for the Handicapped

This study, to be completed in October of 1974, will identify, analyze and compare administrative and organizational designs of vocational education programs serving handicapped students. It will identify, describe and rank educational experiences and supportive services present in vocational education programs for handicapped students. A sample of participating students and graduates will be interviewed.

The study will identify and analyze existing constraints or limitations in carrying out the various vocational education programs for handicapped students, including constraints internal to the program, such as equipment modification or special facilities, and those constraints external to the program, such as limited supportive services within the community, geographic isolation, and reluctance of employers to hire the handicapped.

Information will be developed to assess the feasibility to expand a work experience component in vocational education programs for the handicapped and the necessary conditions under which expansion is possible. This will involve interviews with participating employers in sites where programs have a work experience component as well as interviews with program personnel.

To the extent possible, the study will assess the degree to which funds from the ten percent setaside under Part B actually reach handicapped students rather than become indistinguishable from other vocational education funds.

Analysis of Base Year Data of the National Study of High School Seniors, 1972

The analysis is designed to provide a partial evaluation of the effects of major legislation in vocational education. Specifically, the analysis will use data from the National Longitudinal Study (base year data); Career Threshold (A Longitudinal Study of the Education and Labor Market Experience of Male Youth), referred to as the Parnes study; Years of Decision (A Longitudinal Study of the Educational and Labor Market Experience of Young Women) also referred to as the Parnes study; Vocational Education--Characteristics of Teachers and Students, 1969, and Vocational Education, Characteristics of Teachers and Students--1972.

To be completed in the fall of 1974, the analysis will: (1) assess the effectiveness of secondary programs for vocational education students compared with students pursuing other secondary school curricula; (2) assess the changes in vocational education programs since the enactment of the 1968 Amendments; and (3) determine the relationships among post-program aspirations, performance and the vocational education experiences that the student has received.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972. Educational Testing Service, June 1973.

Major City Secondary Education Systems: Class of 1970 Follow-up Survey of Vocational Program Graduates. Educational Systems Research Institute, December 1972.

Practical Career Guidance, Counseling and Placement for the Noncollege-Bound Students. American Institutes for Research, June 1973.

The Vocational Impact Study: Policy Issues and Analytical Problems in Evaluating Vocational Education: A Study of the State Grant Mechanism; and A Study of Duplication, Gaps, and Coordination of Publicly Funded Skill Training Programs in 20 Cities. National Planning Association, October 1972.

A Comparative Study of Proprietary and Non-Proprietary Vocational Training Programs. American Institutes for Research, November 1972.

National Longitudinal Surveys, Survey of Work Experience of Males, 14-24, 1966, and Survey of Work Experience of Young Men, 1968, Center for Human Resources Research, Ohio State University, and U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of Census, 1966 and 1968, often referred to as the Parnes Study.

A Cost Effective Study of Vocational Education: A comparison of Vocational and nonvocational Education in Secondary Schools. Pennsylvania State University, 1969.

The Effectiveness of Vocational and Technical Education, Center for Vocational and Technical Education, University of Wisconsin, 1971

Trends in Vocational Education, USOE, June 1970.

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

Reports from State Advisory Committees

Reports from the National Advisory Committee

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Program for Students with Special Needs

Legislation:

Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended 1968, Part A, Section 102 (b)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1969	$40,000,000	-0-
	1970	40,000,000	$20,000,000
	1971	50,000,000	20,000,000
	1972	60,000,000	20,000,000
	1973	60,000,000	20,000,000
	1974	60,000,000	20,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Grants are allocated to the States by formula, with no matching required, to assist in providing support for programs and services for persons who are unable to succeed in regular vocational programs because of poor academic background, lack of motivation, and/or depressing environmental factors. Programs are concentrated within the States in communities where there is a high incidence of youth unemployment and high school dropouts. Special services and programs are provided these youth and adults to encourage them to stay in school to acquire the academic and occupational skills needed for successful employment or to continue to pursue their career preparation.

Special services provided include specially trained teachers in remedial and bilingual specialities, staff aides, additional counseling services, facilities accessible to a high concentration of these students, and instructional materials and equipment best suited to their understanding and abilities.

Some of the areas where these funds have been expended are those where English is a second language, rural depressed communities, low-cost housing in the inner city, correctional institutions, and off-reservation locations with a predominance of American Indians.

Program Scope & Effectiveness:

Program data indicate increasing numbers are being served. In fiscal year 1972, about 191,000 students were enrolled under Section 102(b). A total of 152,778 were enrolled in fiscal year 1971. Data on numbers of students eligible for such programs are not available.

State Advisory Council Reports generally reflect a concern about the low percentage of disadvantaged and handicapped being served by vocational education in their respective States. Problems ranging from lack of a valid system for identifying these target groups to lack of special programs to meet their needs were listed. In general, recommendations mentioned that vocational education was not available to all handicapped, and that their needs had not been defined and that the handicapped and disadvantaged in many cases had not been identified statewide.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Council Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Research and Training

Legislation: / **Expiration Date:**

Vocational Education Act of 1963
as amended 1968, Part C

None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$ 11,850,000	$ 11,850,000
1966	17,750,000	17,750,000
1967	22,500,000	10,000,000
1968	22,500,000	13,550,000
1969	35,500,000	11,550,000
1970	56,000,000	1,100,000
1971	67,500,000	35,750,000
1972	67,500,000	18,000,000
1973	67,500,000	18,000,000
1974	67,500,000	18,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

From Fiscal 1965 through Fiscal 1969, all research funds appropriated under the Vocational Education Act were reserved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education for direct Federal grants and contracts. This arrangement was modified by Part C of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, which provided for a division of the funds between the Commissioner and the State Boards for Vocational Education. From 50% of the sums available to each State, the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education, public and private agencies, State boards, and with State board approval - to local educational agencies. The remaining 50% of the funds available to the State are used by the Board in accordance with its State plan.

The Part C funds are used for research; for training programs to familiarize personnel with research results and products; for developmental, experimental, or pilot programs designed to meet the special vocational needs of youth, especially the disadvantaged; for demonstration and dissemination projects; and for establishing and operating State Research Coordinating Units (RCU's).

The RCU is the officially designated unit located in a State Department of Education or a State university which administers the State's vocational research programs and disseminates research findings to administrators, teachers and counselors, and teacher educators. Many RCU's now operate extensive information retrieval and dissemination systems linked to and based on the ERIC system. Other RCU functions include Statewide and local evaluation studies, assistance in State planning efforts, and coordination of State-administered Exemplary Projects under Part D of the Vocational Education Act.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In Fiscal 1973 the Commissioner's portion of the Part C funds were concentrated on career education. This was done by awarding these funds directly to the States on a population formula basis to enable each State to establish a demonstration, testing, and development site for career education model programs, to engage in adaptive curriculum development for tailoring to their own conditions the curriculum materials emerging from various Federal and State career education efforts, and/or to begin the diffusion of tested career education components to other school districts. By the end of Fiscal 1973, refinement and diffusion of model programs of career education were underway in all States as a result of this effort.

Also during Fiscal 73, State funds under Part C supported approximately 425 grants or contracts. Priority areas which received attention were: career education, problems of disadvantaged students, cost-effectiveness and cost-benefits of programs and services, improvement of State and local administration of vocational education, program and system evaluation, new and emerging occupational areas, vocational guidance, follow-up studies of graduates, and employment needs of specific communities.

Because of the legislative changes in FY 70 and the direct distribution of funds to the States in FY 73, it is too soon to make any assessment of the overall impact of this revised Program.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

In Fiscal 73 each of the individual, Federally-administered discretionary projects was required by Federal Regulations to have an independent evaluation by a third-party agency. This evaluation was included in the grant or contract funds provided for the project. The State-administered research projects and the State RCU's were evaluated by the State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education as a part of their overall responsibility for evaluating all programs covered by the State Plan for Vocational Education.

In addition, the Office of Education is negotiating a contract with the National Academy of Science to perform a comprehensive study of the planning, management, and impact of the Federal vocational education research program since its inception in 1965. The study is planned for completion in Fiscal 1976. Also, "Project Baseline," a Federally-funded, ongoing national study of the impact of vocational education programs, plans to include a special component to gather information on the effects of OE funded vocational education research.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Survey of Vocational Education Student and Teacher Characteristics in Public Secondary Schools, 1972. Westat, Inc. Rockville, Md., 1973. (OE Contract OEC-0-72-4577)

Third-party Evaluator Reports on Discretionary Projects

Annual State Vocational Education Reports (State Board funds)

State Advisory Council Reports (State programs)

Annual RCU Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education -- Exemplary Programs

Legislation: **Expiration Date:**

Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended 1968, Part D — June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1969	$ 15,000,000	$ -0-
1970	57,500,000	13,000,000
1971	75,000,000	16,000,000
1972	75,000,000	16,000,000
1973	75,000,000	16,000,000
1974	75,000,000	16,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are awarded to the States for the purpose of stimulating new ways of creating bridges between school and employment for young people, who: (a) are still in school, (b) have left school either by graduation or by dropping out, or (c) are in postsecondary programs of vocational preparation. Additional purposes are the promotion of cooperation between public education and manpower agencies and the broadening of occupational aspirations and opportunities for young people, especially those who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps.

Fifty percent of the appropriation is reserved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education for discretionary grants or contracts to support projects carried out in the States. The remaining 50 percent is allocated to the State Boards for Vocational Education for use in the same manner. Funds reserved by the Commissioner are available until expended and funds allotted to State Boards are available for two fiscal years. No matching is required.

The Federally-administered discretionary projects are distributed geographically across the States, as required by law, with at least one project in operation in each State. The typical project is funded at a level of about $130,000 per year for a three-year period, with the exact amount determined by formula. The funds appropriated in fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 supported the first three-year cycle of projects, most of which began in the Spring of 1970 and end in the Spring of 1973.

The Federally-administered, discretionary projects have been major contributors to the National thrust in career education. The career education techniques and instructional materials emerging from the first three-year cycle of Part D discretionary projects provided input to the design and development of the National Institute of Education's School-Based Career Education Model. These same techniques and materials represented input into the pilot career education projects initiated in FY 1971 with discretionary funds from Part C of the Vocational Education Act. In addition, these Part D projects have served as demonstration sites within each State, providing operational examples of career education functioning in local settings.

State-administered Part D projects are in operation in all States, utilizing the 50 percent of the appropriation allotted to the State Boards for Vocational Education. In FY 1972, 300 State-administered Part D projects were in operation, many of which represented continuations of projects initiated in FY 1970 or FY 1971. About 175 of these projects were focused on various aspects and components of career education.

In a number of States, such as Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Georgia, Mississippi, Wyoming, and Oregon, a systematic, Statewide plan has been formulated for the development and diffusion of career education. These plans provide for coordination through the State Research Coordinating Unit (RCU), which is supported under Part C of the Vocational Education Act. These Statewide plans generally use the discretionary Part D project as a focal point for career education model-building. The plan then involves diffusion of tested career-education components to other school districts throughout the State, utilizing State-administered Part D and Part C funds as well as funds from other sources (such as the Appalachian Regional Commission) to assist school districts in adapting and implementing the career education programs.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

Federally-administered, FY 73 funds were used to initiate a new three-year cycle of about 60 projects, with at least one in each State. Again the average cost was $130,000 per project, and the awards were made in June 1973. At the end of FY 73 plans were made to transfer the operation of this program to the Regional Offices. A meeting of Regional representatives was held on June 28 and 29, 1973 in Washington, and the responsibility for administering the new cycle of projects was officially transferred as of July 1, 1973.

State-administered, FY 73 funds were used to fund about 300 new projects. Of these, approximately 160 are focused on the career education concept.

Program Effectiveness:

All Federally-administered projects have included provisions for a "third-party" evaluator. The funds provided for each grant cover the costs, and the project director is responsible for arranging a sub-contract with an outside agency to evaluate his project. A copy of the evaluation report for each completed project is provided to the OE Program administrators. Where available, they are read individually in connection with decisions about further funding. However, not enough reports have yet been received to suggest that the content provides any basis for drawing generalizations about all projects.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

In June 1973 a one-year contract (OEC-0-73-6663) was awarded to Development

Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C. for an evaluation of the Vocational Exemplary Projects. Fifty site visits to Federally-funded projects will be made to gather information about effectiveness as a demonstration, costs, and impact on students. The study will also gather information on State-administered projects through visits to State Departments to obtain data on the dissemination and replication of exemplary projects, funding patterns, and costs within the State.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual Reports from Directors of Federally-Funded Projects
Third-Party Evaluator's Reports on Federally-Funded Projects
Annual State Reports on State-Administered Projects
State Advisory Council Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Consumer and Homemaking Education

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended in 1968, Part F	June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969		
	1970	$25,000,000	$15,000,000
	1971	35,000,000	21,250,000
	1972	50,000,000	25,625,000
	1973	50,000,000	25,625,000
	1974	50,000,000	30,994,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 and Part F of the Vocational Amendments of 1968 provide formula grants to States for programs in Consumer and Homemaking Education. States must use at least one-third of the Federal funds allocated for programs in economically depressed areas or areas with high rates of unemployment. Fifty percent matching is required except in economically depressed areas or areas with high rates of unemployment where matching is 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State and/or local. The grants to States are to assist them in:

1) Offering educational programs which provide instruction specifically for preparing youth and adults for the occupation of homemaking with emphasis on dual role of homemaker and wage earner, thus contributing to their employability. Programs offered on the junior high, secondary, postsecondary, and adult levels provide instruction for: (a) the improvement of home environments and family life including child growth-development, and parent education; (b) for developing competencies which contribute to employability including programs in management, nutrition and interpersonal relations, and other homemaking skills; and (c) for improvement of consumer behavior by including consumer education as an integral part of all instructional programs; and as a separate independent course to all individuals regardless of objectives.

2) Providing ancillary services and other activities which assure quality in all consumer and homemaking education programs. Ancillary services and activities include support of: (a) State and local supervisory staffs who provide leadership for program development and for the Future Homemakers of America, the vocational student organization which is an integral part of the instructional programs; (b) preservice and inservice education for teachers through workshops, conferences, and individual consultation; (c) curriculum development with special emphasis on consumer education, nutrition education, family life and parent education and programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped, particularly the economically depressed; (d) research, pilot-demonstration programs, evaluation with leadership development for graduate students and (e) start-up of innovative programs in consumer and homemaking education.

Program Scope & Effectiveness:

Since the passage of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, total enrollments in consumer and homemaking education in programs which received Federal funds have increased 47.6 percent. In Fiscal Year 1967, the enrollment totaled 2,129,727 and in Fiscal Year 1972, it was 3,164,292. Eight percent of the total enrollments in Fiscal 1972 were males. In Fiscal Year 1972, there were 870,954 enrolled in programs in depressed areas.

Curriculum revisions over the last five years in many States in consumer and homemaking education make it possible for youth and adults to enroll in comprehensive courses including all six areas of their interest. The following table shows that some areas of home economics have had a greater growth in enrollments than others, which also may reflect some of the particular educational needs of individuals today:

Area of Home Economics	Enrollment-FY 67	Enrollment-FY 72
Consumer and Homemaking (total)	2,129,727	3,164,292
Child Development	64,812	138,589
Clothing and Textiles	285,964	364,659
Consumer Education	4,924	102,055
Family Relations	95,367	190,397
Food and Nutrition	62,348	222,552
Home Management	38,576	55,897
Housing and Home Furnishings	73,562	105,296
Comprehensive Consumer and Homemaking and Other	1,428,190	1,992,540

Estimated enrollments for Fiscal Year 1973 is 3,435,000.

Ongoing and Planned Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

Descriptive Reports submitted by State Departments of Education, State Supervisors of Home Economics

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Cooperative Vocational Education Programs

Legislation: VEA of 1963, as amended 1968, Part G

Expiration Date: June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969	$20,000,000	-0-
	1970	35,000,000	$14,000,000
	1971	50,000,000	18,500,000
	1972	75,000,000	19,500,000
	1973	75,000,000	19,500,000
	1974	75,000,000	19,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are made to the States to support cooperative education programs which involve arrangement between schools and employers, enabling students to receive vocational instruction in the school and related on-the-job training through part-time employment. Priority is given to areas where there is high incidence of student dropouts and youth unemployment. Students must be at least 14 years old and are paid by the employer either a minimum wage or a student-learner rate established by the Department of Labor. Federal support may cover program operation, added training costs to employers, payment for services or unusual costs to students while in training, and ancillary services. Federal funds may be used for all or part of a State's expenditure for programs authorized and approved under State Plan provisions.

Part G cooperative vocational education programs have extended the range of occupations for which training can be offered, such as marketing and distribution, business and office, trade and industrial, and health occupations. In addition there was an emphasis on developing cooperative education programs for small communities which cut across several occupational fields in one program setting. Students could prepare for specific areas of gainful employmen which were not available previously because of insufficient enrollment or lack of facilities to support specialized vocational programs. Most of the new programs were developed in areas with high rates of school dropouts and youth

Part G programs were also provided in the earlier grades to facilitate exploration and development of general work attitudes and skills.

To involve more disadvantaged youth in fiscal year 1973, increased emphasis was given to the implementation of special provisions under Part G which permit the reimbursement to employers for certain added costs incurred in providing on-the-job training and the payment of unusual costs associated with student participation in the program.

Program Scope:

In fiscal year 1972, 459,614 students were enrolled in cooperative education programs, of these 340,690 cooperative students were supported from Part B funds; 118,924 students from Part G.

Under Part G funds, 101,103 students were in secondary programs and 17,452 were in postsecondary. States report that these Part G enrollments include 50,769 disadvantaged students and 6,389 handicapped students. However, States do not report disadvantaged or handicapped students by educational level.

Program Effectiveness:

The first phase of "Assessment of Schoo;-Supervised Work Education Programs" examined the different configurations of work education programs to determine whether they are meeting their intended objectives and to suggest ways in which different types might be modified or expanded. A stratified random sample of 50 work education sites was drawn from 500 representative programs using three variables as the basis for the stratification. The 50 were distributed as follows on the basis of those variables determined as most relevant:

Education level: Secondary (36), postsecondary (14)

Primary purpose: Specific occupational training (30*), dropout prevention (14), career exploration (6)

Industrial setting: Farming region (15), bedroom community (11), single industry are (9), major industrial/business center (15)

---

*Specific occupational training programs are generally those funded under Part G. Findings relating to Work Study (or Dropout prevention) programs are reported in the following section which describes programs funded under Part H of the 1968 Amendments.

According to the study findings, cooperative education programs appear to be generating the most enthusiasm among students, employers, and school officials because they meet the expressed needs and objectives of all groups. Students feel that cooperative education programs are providing them with valuable job training. Employers feel that they are getting their money's worth from student workers and are contributing to their profession. School administrators and teachers are satisfied with the learning experiences and job placements after the training period.

Cooperative education programs are reported as more likely than other types of programs to: (1) provide students with job-related instruction in school; (2) provide job placement services and have a high rate of job-related placements; (3) help students in deciding on an occupation; and (4) provide students with jobs that fit into their career plans, have a high level of responsibility and afford a high degree of satisfaction.

But there are some negative findings compared with other types, cooperative progr are (1) more apt to discriminate against students on the basis of student attitude; (2) less effective in reducing student absenteeism; (3) more apt to interfere with students'other activities in school and out; (4) more apt to segregate job placements by sex, and (5) more likely to restrict their offerings to students with rather conforming, middle-class behaviors.

Employers participating in secondary level work education programs, regardless of purpose, rated overall program quality significantly higher than did employers participating in postsecondary programs. However, from the standpoint of related placements and quality of training, the postsecondary occupational training programs were superior to their secondary counterparts.

The employer ratings of individual work education students proved to be a very significant variable in gaining an understanding of work education programs. For students, a higher rating by the employer was associated with greater job satisfaction, and for employers a higher average rating of his students was associated with a higher rating of overall program quality. Thus, careful matching of students to jobs which meet their career objectives, so that they are likely to succeed and be highly rated by their employers, appears to be one of the most crucial tasks for work education programs, in terms of both student satisfaction and employer acceptance.

Pay factors played an important role in determining the way the employers in the study sample viewed work education programs. Where students were paid less than regular employees, employers were significantly more likely to rate the program's overall quality as excellent.

From the students' point of view, pay plays a minor and somewhat ambiguous role: students who are paid for their work are slightly, but not statistically significantly, more satisfied with their jobs than students who are not paid. But the attitude of those not paid toward school is likely to improve after joining the program. These findings were not predicted and the reasons for them are unclear.

The industrial/community setting in which the program was located played a minor role as far as the characteristics of the various work education programs were concerned, and most variations found were not unexpected--for instance, pay rates and the proportion of ethnic minorities involved were higher in urban areas than elsewhere. The one surprising finding was that the level of students' satisfaction with their jobs was significantly higher among programs in rural settings than among programs in any of the other three types of settings.

Postsecondary programs are more effective than those at secondary school level in nearly all aspects; specifically, they rated higher on job-related instruction, job-related placements, student followup, helping students to decide on an occupation, and providing them with jobs that fit into their career plans, with jobs with high responsibility ratings and with jobs with which they are highly satisfied. Two exceptions were found, however, employers rated secondary students higher than those from postsecondary educational institutions, and secondary students earn slightly more than do postsecondary school student workers.

Two components of student satisfaction were considered in this study. First, how do students participating in work education programs compare with similar vocational students who are not participating in work education programs but are holding jobs with respect to (1) their degree of satisfaction with the jobs they held, and (2) improvement in their satisfaction toward school after they joined the work education program or began working. The two student groups differed little in terms of their satisfaction with their jobs, but satisfaction with school increased to a significantly greater degree among students participating in work education programs than among those working but not involved with the program. The most important influence on the student's job satisfaction were how well he was rated by his employer and the degree to which he felt this job afforded him responsibility.

Level of job responsibility also had a positive impact in improving a student's attitude toward school. (Other than this, only such non-manipulable background characteristics as ethnicity, sex and age appeared to influence changes in satisfaction with school after a student enrolled in the work education program.)

The study was also concerned with determining to what degree these programs were fostering discriminatory practices. It was found that while no programs would admit to overt discrimination, subtler forms were rather common. Thus, while the majority of the programs were integrated, only 30 percent of the interviewed employers had been assigned students of more than one race. Sexual stereotypes were being fostered in a similar manner with only 39 percent of the employers receiving students of both sexes.

Cost Effectiveness of Selected Cooperative Vocational Programs:

This exploratory study examined data fromm 11 school districts in 3 States to obtain cost comparisons with cooperative vocational education programs and regular vocational programs. While no obvious differences were found in the cost of either program, the analysis was hampered because of the inability to make direct comparisons since similar programs are seldom offered using both methods.

Effectiveness comparisons were based on standard follow-up information provided by the schools. In addition a brief survey of employers was conducted to obtain their attitudes about graduates of cooperative programs versus non-cooperative programs. School data indicated no obvious difference in the work experience of the two groups. However, the employer survey showed a definite difference. The sample of employers favored graduates of co-op students (59 percent over those of non co-op), (4 percent with 37 percent indicating no difference. School data indicated that the co-op students have little difficulty finding jobs and that a substantial percentage of co-op students (46 percent) were able to continue full-time employment with their co-op employer.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The second phase of the Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs will provide (1) outcome information for the 1800-2000 students identified as program participants and the non-participant control group about 18 months after they graduated or left school; (2) an additional sample of 50 case studies which focus on secondary and postsecondary cooperative education programs in urban areas. The first case studies focused on the widest range of programs. Findings are fairly clear as to the success of small cooperative education programs in serving persons from middle-class background and attitudes. They were less conclusive, partially because of the size of the sample, about the viability and the constraints in limiting expansion of cooperative education programs in inner city settings, in larger school districts, in serving large numbers of minority, handicapped or persons with special needs. This is scheduled to begin the spring of 1974.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

An Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs. Systems Development Corporation, October 1973.

Cost Effectiveness of Selected Cooperative Vocational Education Programs as Compared with Vocational Programs without Cooperative Component. Battelle Columbus Laboratories, June, 1973.

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Committee Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Work Study Programs

Legislation:

VEA of 1963, as amended 1968 Part H, extended by P.L. 91-230 and P.L. 92-318

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965	$30,000,000	$ 5,000,000
	1966	50,000,000	25,000,000
	1967	35,000,000	10,000,000
	1968	35,000,000	10,000,000
	1969	35,000,000	-0-
	1970	35,000,000	4,250,000
	1971	45,000,000	5,500,000
	1972	55,000,000	6,000,000
	1973	55,000,000	6,000,000
	1974	55,000,000	7,849,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are allocated to the States for work-study programs to assist economically disadvantaged full-time vocational educational students, ages 15-20, to remain in school by providing part-time employment with public employers. Priority is given to areas of high school dropout rates and youth unemployment. Funds are used for the administration of the program and for compensation of students by the local educational agencies or other public agencies or institutions. Matching is 80 percent Federal and 20 percent State and local.

Work study is essentially an income maintenance program for the economically deprived youth who are in school. Only about 2 percent of the Federal funds is used for administration; nearly all funds, about 98 percent go directly to needy students in the form of wages for a public service job.

Students provided financial assistance are the economically disadvantaged who are apt to drop out of school before obtaining sufficient job skills for economic independence. Retention of these students in school opens numerous additional options for the student in employment and further education.

Program Scope:

Vocational work study was first authorized in the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The cumulative enrollment since then has been nearly 250,000 students. Some 28,726 secondary and postseoncdary students were served in fiscal year 1971; in 1972, the number increased to 30,896, of these, 23,201 were secondary and 7,695 were postsecondary.

While the primary purpose of the work study program is to provide financial support, reports from the States reveal that other gains accrue, such as efforts to find employment in areas related to the vocational instruction. Typical positions held by work-study students included: food service worker, clerk-typist, hospital aide, printing assistant, drafting assistant, furniture repairman, and appliance repairman.

Program Effectiveness:

Work study programs appear to be meeting their basic objective which is to keep students in school by providing them with financial assistance, according to the "Assessment of School Supervised Work Education" study completed in the fall of 1973. (The study is further described in the section relating to Cooperative Education programs.)

While many work study programs have additional goals such as improving the disadvantaged youngster's sttitudes toward school and work, very few attempt to offer students related classwork or intensive vocational training, the report indicates. Students are placed primarily in unskilled blue collar and clerical jobs.

"It was apparent that many students were placed in rather boring deadend jobs which didn't challenge their capabilities, gave them no real appreciation for the world of work and failed to allow them to explore career interests on their own," the report stated. As indicative of this, only 6 percent of the cooperative education programs were in the lowest category of job responsibility scale whereas 75 percent of the secondary work education students were in this category. Similarly, when asked whether or not their work education programs helped them to decide on an occupation, 35 percent of the secondary students in cooperative education said "yes" as compared with only 18 percent in the work study programs.

Analysis of pay factors indicate that students in work study programs are more likely than any other type of program to offer students jobs paying at least the minimum wage. Work study students work primarily for money; however, cooperative students indicated that getting occupational training experience was more important than pay.

Ongoing or Planned Evaluation Studies:

A follow-up of the participating students and the control group interviewed in the first phase of the"School Supervised Work Education Study" is planned for FY 1975. A feasibility phase to test recovery rates is planned. If an 85% response rate can be obtained, the students will be re-interviewed.

The follow-up of the original sample study will provide information about what happens to work study students after they graduate. Data should indicate whether they completed their training, learned a skill which they could use after graduation and in general, whether those students in work-study programs fared better than the control groups.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs.
Systems Development Corporation, September 1973.

Annual State Reports

State Advisory Committee Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education — Curriculum Development

Legislation:

VEA of 1963, as amended, Part I

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1969	$ 7,000,000	$ -0-
1970	10,000,000	880,000
1971	10,000,000	4,000,000
1972	10,000,000	3,981,000
1973	10,000,000	4,000,000
1974	10,000,000	4,000,000

Program Purpose and Objectives:

Part I of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended, authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to or contracts with colleges and universities, State boards, and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions for curriculum development in vocational and technical education. No matching funds are required.

The Curriculum Development Program provides for the development, testing, and dissemination of vocational education curriculum materials for use in teaching occupational subjects, including curriculums for new and changing occupational fields and vocational teacher education. It further provides for: developing standards for curriculum development in all occupational fields; coordinating the efforts of the States with respect to curriculum development and management; surveying curriculum materials produced by other agencies; evaluating vocational-technical education curriculum materials; and training personnel in curriculum development.

Most of these activities are carried out through individual projects. However, there are also seven Curriculum Laboratories which cover the country and which provide a network for national coordination.

Nineteen curriculum projects were funded in FY '70, 20 projects in FY '71, and 33 in FY '72. Since almost all projects are full-funded, these figures generally represent new starts.

Program Scope:

The FY '73 budget allotted $4,000,000 for vocational education curriculum development of which $3,959,062 was obligated for 29 projects. The projects funded fall into five major categories as follows: curriculum laboratories and coordination of curriculum efforts; curriculum and career education dissemination; post-secondary curriculum development and evaluation; occupational cluster development, evaluation, and testing; and career education curriculum development.

In the curriculum laboratories and coordination of curriculum efforts category, two new laboratories were funded for a total of $360,000. One is in the Northwest and one in the Eastern part of the United States. Thus, with the five laboratories funded the previous year, coverage of all States was completed.

The second major category, that of curriculum and career education dissemination, involved six projects in the amount of $75,000. These efforts provided for the dissemination of career education curriculum materials and seven listings of vocational curriculum materials developed by and available from the States involved.

The thrid category, post-secondary curriculum development and evaluation, includes six continuation projects in the amount of $824,150. The projects are in the technology fields of nuclear-medicine, laser and electro-optics, bio-medicine, electro-mechansics, concrete, and allied health.

The fourth category involved funding 10 projects in the occupational cluster areas for an amount of $2,237,930. Three of the projects related to the Business and Office cluster, one to the Marketing and Distribution cluster, one to articulation from the secondary to the post-secondary level in occupational education, and the rest to the testing and evaluation of five previously developed clusters.

In the category of career education, accomplishments included the publication of a special issue of Aesthetic Education, the product of a project aimed at the development of guidelines for career education in the arts; a survey of career education programs by the Chief State School Officers Association with the development of plans for their support and action with respect to their role in career education; and curriculum modules for individualized instruction in selected areas of human development.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Program Reports from Project Directors.
Site-Visit Reports by OE Program Staff.
Reports and Newsletters from Curriculum Centers.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education -- Grants to States

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Adult Education Act of 1966 (P.L. 91-230, Title III)	June 30, 1973 (Extended)

Funding History:	**Year**	**Authorization**	**Appropriation**
	1965	Under Econ. Opp. Act	$ 18,612,000
	1966	" " " "	19,689,063
	1967	$ 40,000,000	26,280,000
	1968	60,000,000	32,200,000
	1969	70,000,000	36,000,000
	1970	160,000,000	40,000,000
	1971	200,000,000	44,875,000
	1972	225,000,000	51,134,000
	1973	225,000,000	51,300,000
	1974	225,000,000	53,485,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program is operated through formula grants made to States for the education of adults. The program is directed toward adults who are 16 years of age or older and who have not achieved the 12th-grade level of education. The purpose is to enable them to become more employable, productive, and responsible citizens.

Local school districts submit plans and proposals to the State education agency which makes the funding decisions. Ten percent of the total cost of any program must be covered by the State and/or local education agency, with up to 90 percent covered by Federal funds allocated to the State. The average State matching in Fiscal 1972 was approximately 25 percent.

Special emphasis is given to providing adult basic education classes for those adults with less than an 8th-grade education. The law states that such basic education programs must be provided first, and that additional programs may be offered only when these needs can be shown to have been met. States which have met the need for adult basic education in a particular school district or geographic area may then expend up to 20 percent of their Federal-State grant for adult secondary education programs leading to a high-school equivalency degree.

Among those eligible to be served are the approximately 800,000 public school stude
who drop out each year and who are therefore eligible candidates for adult secondary programs. There are also about 400,000 immigrants arriving each year of whom a substantial number need instruction in English as a second language in or

to function as citizens in the United States. In Fiscal 1972, the last year for which such data are currently available, about 18 percent of the participants in State Grant Programs were enrolled in English as a second language. About 12 percent of the enrollees in basic programs were institutionalized in mental hospitals, prisons, or other facilities.

Program Scope:

The target group at which this program is directed consists of about 52.5 million adults age 16 or over who have not completed high school and who are not currently enrolled.* Within this group special emphasis is directed toward approximately 18,000,000 adults with less than 8 years of formal education.

Complete enrollment data for the Fiscal Year 1973 is not yet available. However, since the majority of State reports have been received, it appears that the '73 figures will not differ substantially from those reported for FY 72 but may run slightly lower. This is because funding for the Program remains level but the inflation factor results in a slight decrease in services provided.

In Fiscal 1972 approximately 800,000 adults were enrolled, of which 55.9 percent (458,346) were female. There were 216,000 unemployed and 83,000 who were receiving public assistance. States also reported that 260,000 participants upgraded their educational level by receiving certificates of completion at the 8th-grade level, by passing the General Education Development Test, by graduating from high school, or by enrolling in some other educational program as a result of having been enrolled in an adult basic education program.

Program Effectiveness:

An evaluation of the adult basic education program was completed by the Systems Development Corporation in November 1973. This study, which began in June 1971, was the first Nationwide effort at evaluating the program. The study focused on examining the effects of the ABE program on the priority group -- adults from 18 to 44 years of age with less than 8 years of schooling. The sample included 2,300 students representing 200 classes, 90 programs, and 15 States. This national sample represented the 280,000 students enrolled in ABE programs in FY 70 who fell within the defined population. Students were tested twice and interviewed three times.

Additional information was collected and findings are available to describe the ABE programs and classes, the characteristics of the students, gains in reading and math, class and student cost data, and State and local approaches to establishing new classes and using innovations. Among the highlights in the findings are the following:

1. An average local program provided about 43 classes, per year, each serving approximately 16 students. Local

---

*This is a recent estimate by NCES based on 1972 Census data.

administrators estimated that the mean annual expenditure from all sources was about $4,000 per class per year, or an average of about $250 per training slot which may serve three or more students per year. (However, State reports indicate that the average Federal cost is approximately $70 per student.)

2. Most classes meet in school buildings two evenings per week from September through May. The average session was about three hours. Instruction was offered at many different levels in any given class. Frequently a single class would involve all grade levels from 1 through 8. The class was usually taught by a certificated teacher with more than two years of experience in teaching adults. Almost all teachers had also received some special training for adult teaching but taught adults only part-time.

3. Most classes emphasized reading and mathematics, but the basic instruction covered skills for job improvement, writing, preparation for high school studies, and "life skills" such as citizenship responsibilities and consumer education.

4. Although more than half of the students reported having completed nine or more years in school, their average scores on initial tests showed achievement at the 5th grade level in reading and at the 6th grade level in mathematics. A second test showed that, in a period of 16 weeks, the average student gained six months in reading and from 3 to 4 months in mathematics. About one fourthe of the students tested gained a full grade or more in reading in the 16-week period, and one fifth gained a grade or more in mathematics.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Program Reports

Annual State Financial Reports

Regional Office Reports on Selected Merit Award Programs

Regional Office Reports on Site-Visits to Programs and State Departments

HEW Reports on State Funds Audits

Longitudinal Evaluation of the Adult Basic Education Program, System Development Corporation (Final Report TM-WD-5743), November 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education -- Special Projects

Legislation:

Adult Education Act of 1966
(P.L. 91-230, Title III, Section 309(b)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1966	Under Econ. Opp. Act.	
	1967	Under P.L. 89-750*	$ 1,520,162
	1968	" " "	6,550,000
	1969	" " "	7,000,000
	1970	Under P.L. 91-230*	7,900,000
	1971	" " "	6,639,984
	1972	" " "	6,992,563
	1973	" " "	7,000,000
	1974	" " "	7,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Project grants are awarded to State or local educational agencies or other public or private nonprofit agencies, including Educational Television stations, for the purpose of experimenting with and developing improvements in adult education. The results of the Special Projects are used to strengthen the existing State Grant Program. The Projects supported involve (1) the use of innovative methods, systems, materials, or programs which may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs in adult education, or (2) the support of programs carried out in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local efforts which have unusual promise in developing a comprehensive approach to the problems of people with educational deficiences.

Priorities are developed on an annual basis to assure that the program reflects current needs. Wherever feasible, the grant recipient is required to provide 10 percent of the cost of the project. The projects are designed to yield results which can be replicated by a local school system.

---

*Both P.L. 89-750 and P.L. 91-230 include a specification for the use of not less than 10% nor more than 20% of the total AE appropriation for Special Projects and Training.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

The target group at which this program aims is the estimated 52.5 million adults age 16 or over who have not completed high school and who are not currently enrolled.* Within this group special emphasis is given to the needs of adults between ages 18 and 44 who are functioning at or below the fifth-grade level.

During the Fiscal Year 1973 there were 55 grants for Special Projects. These included 26 new awards and 29 grant renewals for projects begun in previous years.

The major priorities during FY 73 were as follows:

Adoption and diffusion of adult education information and materials

Adult career education models

Adult education programs for educationally disadvantaged parents

Adult secondary education models

Exemplary programs for educationally disadvantaged adults

Indian adult education programs

Model Cities adult education programs

Program Effectiveness:

To date information about the effectiveness of the Special Projects program has been obtained primarily on site visits under the Program Assistance Review Team System (PART). Under this procedure the Office of Education Project Monitor, the Regional Office Adult Education Officer, and the State Director of Adult Education form a team to make the site visit. After it is concluded, each writes an independent report of his observations and recommendations.

---

*This is a recent estimate by NCES based on 1972 Census data.

In addition, wherever it is feasible and/or appropriate, the Special Project includes provisions for an independent, third-party evaluation. The determination of feasibility is made by the initiator and the OE Project Monitor according to pertinent regulations before the grant is made final.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The FY 74 OE evaluation plan includes a study of the "Effectiveness of Adult Education Special Projects Program." The purposes of this evaluation are to determine: (1) the kinds of projects supported in terms of content or problem area and special target group within the adult population, (2) the outcomes which have resulted from the projects, (3) the extent to which the products or outcomes have been adopted and/or adapted in other Federal, State, or local AE programs, (4) the current need for additional products tailored to special sub-groups of adults, and (5) changes in the Special Projects Program policies and funding criteria which would further define its mission and strengthen the State Grant program.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Special Projects Reports, both semi-annual and final

Program Assistance Review TEam Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education -- Teacher Training

Legislation:

Adult Education Act of 1966
(P.L. 91-230, Title III, Section 309(c)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973
(Extended)

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1966	Under Econ. Opp. Act.	$ 1,055,000
	1967	Under P.L. 89-750*	1,399,838
	1968	" " "	1,500,000
	1969	" " "	2,000,000
	1970	Under P.L. 91-230*	2,000,000
	1971	" " "	3,360,016
	1972	" " "	3,007,437
	1973	" " "	3,000,000
	1974	" " "	3,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Project grants are awarded to institutions of higher education, State or local educational agencies, or other public or private nonprofit agencies to promote and coordinate the training of personnel who work or are preparing to work in adult education. A primary purpose is to develop resources for increasing the scope and effectiveness of adult education under the State Grant Program. In addition to teachers, training is provided for administrators, counselors, and paraprofessionals. The Training Projects have also been used to emphasize coordination among educational institutions, to sensitize adult education personnel to the unique needs of educationally disadvantaged adults, and to develop and implement new instructional materials and techniques.

A major redirection in the training of personnel for adult education programs took place in Fiscal 1972 with a shift of emphasis from summer workshop programs to the regional planning and coordination of staff development activities.

---

*Both P.L. 89-750 and P.L. 91-230 include a specification for the use of not less than 10% nor more than 20% of the total AE appropriation for Special Projects and Training.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

Fiscal 1973 funds were focused on the continued development of the regionally-based staff development efforts. There were nine projects directed toward regional adult eduation personnel needs which required a total of about 2.2 million for their second year. The projects will continue for an additional year with Federal funding, after which they will be sustained by State and institutional funds. (During FY 73 approximately 23,500 people participated in training programs supported by FY 72 funds.)

The remaining Fiscal 1973 teacher training funds available (approximately $800,000) are supporting five additional projects which provide for resource development, correctional personnel training, Indian educational leadership development, instructional content improvement, and studies in cultural and ethnic understanding.

It is important that minorities be adequately represented in adult education leadership positions, and that adult education staff be sensitized to the needs and values of culturally and ethnically different adults. To begin to meet these needs, Fiscal Year 1974 teacher training priorities will include, in addition to the continuation of the staff development programs, the establishment of career development and cross-cultural training projects. Priorities also include projects in support of the staff development programs.

One measure of the effectiveness of these training programs for adult education personnel will be the extent to which they are supported by State and local resources after Federal support is terminated. At present all States are using some portion of their State grant funds to support training activities, although the amounts vary. Universities, colleges, and other agencies are also providing supplementary training support in some States. These funds are in addition to those provided for Federally-supported training projects.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The plan on which each training grant is based provides either for the collection of evaluative data by the grantee or for a third-party evaluation of the project by an evaluator selected by the grantee.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Semi-annual and Annual Project Reports

Written reports of site visits by OE staff

Written reports of site visits, made at least twice each year, by the Regional Program Officer for Adult Education.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA)

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962	June 30, 1974

FUNDING HISTORY:

(Appropriations for MDTA)
(are made to the Department)
(of Labor. Funds are transferred)
(to DHEW for institutional)
(training.)

Total Federal obligations for
institutional training includi
allowances paid trainee:

1965	$249,348,000
1966	281,710,000
1967	215,588,000
1968	221,847,000
1969	213,505,000
1970	256,071,000
1971	276,767,000
1972	355,407,000
1973	303,814,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor jointly administer programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act. These programs are aimed at reducing the level of unemployment, offsetting skill shortages, and enhancing the skills and productivity of the Nation's work force. The major tool used is education and training of those who are out of a job or are working at less than their full potential.

Under the Act the Secretary of Labor must assess the need for training, select the trainees, provide allowances and other training beneftis, and help trainees get jobs. He is also responsible for job-development programs and experimental and demonstration projects, and for working with employers to develop on-the-job training (OJT).

Institutional training coupled with OJT projects is a further responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as is institutional training offered to residents of redevelopment areas, communities which are severely depressed economically and the instructional aspects of experimental and demonstration projects, as well as MDTA training in correctional institutions.

Most training programs are operated through State agreements. Training is provided through public educational agencies or private institutions. The State Agency is paid not more than 90% of the cost to the State for carrying out the agreement.

MDTA trainees are out-of-school unemployed or underemployed persons --in fiscal year 1973, 58% were considered to be seriously disadvantaged, over 1/2 had been unemployed over 15 weeks during the past year, 36 percent had not finished high school, 34 percent belonged to a minority race, 36 percent were under age 22, 7 percent were over 44 and 12 percent were handicapped.

Program Scope:

Since the beginning of the MDTA program in August of 1962, 1,404,200 persons have been enrolled in the institutional training program, 68 percent completed their training objective and 50 percent of those completing secured employment. Part of the remaining 50 percent were called into the armed forces, some returned to full-time school, and others withdrew from the labor force.

In fiscal year 1973, 104,500 trainees completed institutional training and 77,500 (74 percent) had secured employment and were still on the job when last contacted.

First time enrollments:

1963	32,000
1964	68,600
1965	145,300
1966	177,500
1967	150,000
1968	140,000
1969	135,000
1970	130,000
1971	155,600
1972	150,600
1973	119,600

Training has been conducted in over 300 different occupational skills ranging from accounting clerk to x-ray technician. Clerical occupations comprise the largest group, almost 20 percent of the total enrollments.

Program Effectiveness:

The MDTA institutional training program appears to be generally effective in providing training and services to unemployed and underemployed adults according to national data and a series of evaluation studies jointly developed and administered by the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Labor.

MDTA Basic Education Study:

The study of 17 Training Centers found that MDTA Basic Education trainees made a statistically significant gain in reading and computational ability. The average trainee entering at about the 7th grade level (after reaching the 10th grade in school) emerges in 6 months at the 8th grade level, and with an Occupational skill. He, or she, is much more adept at fractions and decimals, can operate a micrometer, or can now calculate interest rates for time payment plans. He or she can read faster, reads a wider variety of materials, and has increased his or her vocabulary beyond purely technical terms. Classroom situations have improved communications skills and self confidence.

Black trainees appear to enter with reading problems that are not adequately compensated for in training, but they do well in Math. Spanish-surnamed trainees also suffer from a reading disadvantage, but make good gains for reading nontheless.

The training center staff and instructors are well qualified in the traditional terms and resourceful in adapting materials and techniques to the MDTA training situation. Technical training in individualized instruction, diagnostic procedures, and in planning and monitoring goal achievement would be helpful.

The development of effective scheduling procedures combining individualized instruction by ability level with concurrent occupational training would make the most immediate improvement in the program. Improved training in individualized instruction and better facilities and materials would help too. However, the use of techniques and materials must be integrated into an overall program for the trainee. Those training centers having the most influence on trainee gains were those where management, coordination, and cooperation were outstanding.

Planned and Ongoing Studies:

The Evaluation of the Availability and Effectiveness of MDTA Institutional Training and Employment Services for Women will be completed in March, 1974.

> The evaluation will develop a synthesis of information useful to MDTA planners and administrators about the effectiveness of MDTA training and services in preparing women for entry and re-entry jobs in the labor market. Effectiveness measures will include: pre-and post-training earnings, labor force participation, employment stability and factors relating to attitude and motivation as analyzed from evaluation and research reports, national data and other sources.

The study will review and analyze data relating to occupational offerings in which women are enrolled in skills centers, class-size projects and individual referrals. The contractor will analyze: (a) to what extent courses are sex-stereotyped; (b) to what extent efforts are being broad in training opportunities for women; (c) to identify, analyze and describe the inhibiting factors (such as length of training, cost of training, labor market requirements, women's perception of their roles, referral, recruitment and counseling practices, etc.) which affect the broadening of training opportunities for women.

In examining how the MDTA system works for the woman client, the contractor will analyze: (a) how women fare in the recruitment, selection and referral process; (b) differences in job placement for women and salary comparability with that of men doing the same job. The contractor will also identify and analyze factors which appear to affect adversely the performance of women during the MDTA training, their completion of the training program and, if possible, factors which affect participation in the labor market.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

A series of evaluation studies of the MDTA Institutional Training Program have been jointly developed and administered by the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Labor. These include:

1) MDTA Basic Education Study. North American Rockwell, April 1973.

2) Manpower Development and Training Act Outcomes Study. Decision Making Information, April 1972.

3) Effectiveness in Institutional Manpower Training in Meeting Employers Needs in Skills Shortage Occupations. Olympus Research Corporation, May 1972.

4) A Study of Individual Referrals under MDTA. Olympus Research Corporation, June 1972.

5) Evaluation of the Relevance and Quality of Preparation under the MDTA Institutionsl Training Program. Mentec Corporation, May 1971.

6) Evaluation of Manpower Development and Training Skills Centers. Olympus Research Corporation, February 1971.

7) An Analysis and Evaluation of MDTA Institutional Programs Systems and Practices. North American Rockwell Information Systems Company, April 1971.

Other Sources of Information:

Annual State Evaluation Reports

Annual Manpower Report of the Secretary of HEW to the Congress, 1963 to 1971, "Education and Training..."

"A National Attitude Study of Trainees in MDTA Institutional Programs" Gerald Gurin, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, August 1971.

Manpower Report of the President, annual 1963 to 1973.

D. Higher Education Programs

1. Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program
2. Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants Program
3. College Work-Study Program
4. Cooperative Education Program
5. Guaranteed Student Loan Program
6. National Direct Student Loan Program
7. Upward Bound Program
8. Educational Talent Search Program
9. Special Services for Disadvantaged Students
10. Strengthening Developing Institutions
11. Annual Interest Grants
12. Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities
13. State Administration and Planning
14. Language Training and Area Studies
15. Fulbright-Hays Act
16. Community Service and Continuing Education Program
17. Land Grant Colleges and Universities Program
18. College Teacher Fellowships
19. Higher Education Personnel Fellowships
20. EPDA, Part E Institutes
21. College Personnel Development, Fellowships for the Disadvantaged
22. College Personnel Development, Allen J. Ellender Fellowships
23. Veterans Cost-of-Instruction Program
24. Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program

Legislation:

Education Amendments of 1972, Title I;
Public Law 92-318, 86 Stat., 248-251

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1973	(Such sums as may be necessary)	$122,000,000
	1974		475,000,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

To help qualified students finance their post-secondary education, the Education Amendments of 1972 included a program of basic opportunity grants. The program, Title IV, subpart A-1 of the amended Higher Education Act, applies to half-time as well as to full-time students, and to post-secondary vocational, technical, and proprietary institutions as well as to colleges. The grants are not available for graduate study but may extend to five years of undergraduate work under special circumstances specified by the Act. At full funding, the program provides a grant of $1400 less expected family contribution, but not to exceed one-half the cost of attendance. The law provides a reduction formula for less than full funding.

The law requires a schedule of expected family contribution to be submitted to Congress, it limits payments, and it specifies how grants are to be adjusted to appropriation at less than full funding.

a. Family contribution schedule: The law requires the Commissioner to submit to Congress, by the first of February, a schedule indicating amounts families in given financial circumstances will be expected to contribute toward the student's educational expenses. The schedule takes into account such indicators of financial strength as income, assets, family size, and number of family members in post-secondary education. Congress is to react by the first of May, and, if Congress disapproves the schedule, the Commissioner must resubmit a schedule within 15 days. The family contribution schedule, to together with rules governing allowable costs, are important determinants of the number of participants and size of an individual's grant.

b. Statutory formula for grant size: When the family contribution schedule is accepted, and interpreted for a student, grant size is determined by application of a statutory formula in the authorizing legislation:

(1) At full funding: At full funding, as mentioned above, the program provides a grant of $1400 less expected family contribution, but not to exceed one-half the cost of attendance.

(2) At less than full funding: Grants are to be adjusted to available funds by the following formula:

(a) If $1400 minus expected parental contribution is:

more than $1,000,	pay 75% of the amount
$801 to $1,000,	pay 70% of the amount
$601 to $800,	pay 65% of the amount
-0- to $600,	pay 50% of the amount

No grant, however, shall be more than one-half of the "need" (cost minus parental contribution), unless available funds are 75% (but less than 100%) of the amount needed for full funding, in which case no grant shall be more than 60% of "need".

(b) The authorizing legislation provides that if available funds exceed the amount needed to pay grants computed by the above reduction formula, the excess will be paid in proportion to the difference between the amount found by the above formula and the amount that would have been paid at full funding.

(c) If available funds are less than needed to pay grants computed by the reduction formula, then grants are prorated down to the amount available.

(d) At full funding, no grant of less than $200 will be paid. At less than full funding, the minimum grant is $50.

(e) The law provides that social security benefits paid to or on account of a student because he is a student and half of veteran's educational benefits will be counted as the effective income of the student.

Program Scope:

The latest program data show that as of February 25, 1974, over 500,000 applications had been received. Of these, approximately 55% qualified for assistance.

Since November 11th, applications have been received at a rate of approximately 10,000 per week. As of February 25, the cumulative total was approximately 500,000. The deadline for receipt of applications is April 1, 1974.

Program Effectiveness:

The 1973-74 academic year is the first year during which this program has been in operation. Information on the impact of the program is not available at this time.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Education is currently engaged in feasibility and design efforts directed towards the preparation of a new study which will attempt to assess the impact of all OE-sponsored student assistance programs.

Source of Evaluation Data:

No information is available at this time.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Public Law 92-318, 86 Stat. 251.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1974	$200,000,000 *	$210,300,000

* Plus such sums as may be needed for continuation grants.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG) funds for initial year awards are apportioned among the several states in the same ratio as the sum of 1) the number of persons enrolled full-time and 2) the full-time equivalent of the number of persons enrolled part-time in institutions of higher education in each state may bear in relation to the total such enrollment in the United States. Renewal year awards are alloted in accordance with regulations published by the Commissioner of Education. Grants, which are awarded by institutions of higher education, are designed to provide additional resources for students whose financial resources would be otherwise insufficient to permit attendance. The maximum award is $1,500 per year or one-half of the sum of the total amount of student financial aid provided to such student by the institution--whichever is the lesser. The total amount of funds awarded to any student, over the course of his academic career, may not exceed $4,000--except in those instances in which a student is enrolled in a program of study extending over five academic years or for students, whose particular circumstances as determined by the institution, require an additional year to complete a program of study which normally requires four academic years. The limit is then set at $5,000. Awards are limited to students who have been accepted as undergraduates at their respective institutions, who maintain satisfactory progress, who are enrolled at least one-half time, and who would be financially unable to pursue a program of study at such institution without such an award.

Program Scope:

While the SEOG Program is new, some indication if its scope may be derived by reference to the prior EOG Program. In that Program, during the 1972-73 academic year, the program included 2,300 participating institutions. Approximately 300,000 students received grants--an average of $670. Public universities received 37.9% of the funds distributed; other public four-year institutions, 7.2%; public two-year colleges, 15.6%; private universities, 13.0%; other private four-year schools, 12.5%; and private two-year institutions, 3.0%, (proprietary 5.6%).

Of the students who received grants an estimated 31.0% had family incomes of less than $2,999; 41.7% had incomes of $3,000 to $5,999; 15.2% $6,000 to $7,499; 7.9% $7,500 to $8,999, and 4.2% had family incomes greater than $9,000. These distributions include both dependent and independent students. Estimated others--social characteristics of BOG recipients for academic year 1972-73 are: Black, 29.5%; American Indian, .6%; Oriental American, 1.3%; Spanish Surnamed, 5.6% and other, 63.0%. One measure of demand for program assistance--panel approved requests from participating institutions--was the amount of institutional requests for FY 1972--$259,084,000. This, in comparison with available funds of $177,377,000, demonstrates a demand which may be met through the combined assistance of Basic and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants.

Program Effectiveness:

Because the Program is too new to judge its effectiveness, the prior EOG was judged to have had moderate success in providing assistance to students with exceptional financial need according to a 1972 evaluation study by the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Education is currently engaged in feasibility and design efforts directed towards the preparation of a new study which will attempt to assess the impact of all OE-sponsored student assistance programs.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

The Federal Educational Opportunity Grant Program: A Status Report, Fiscal Year 1970, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, New York, 1971.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Higher Education Factbook.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

College Work-Study Program

Legislation:

Public Law 88-452, Title I, (42 U.S.C. 2751), 78 Stat. 515; as amended by Public Law 89-329, Title IV, 79 Stat. 1249; as amended by Public Law 90-515, Title I, 82 Stat. 1028-1029.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation*
1965	1/	$ 55,710,000
1966	$129,000,000	99,123,000
1967	165,000,000	134,100,000
1968	200,000,000	139,900,000
1969	225,000,000	139,900,000
1970	275,000,000	152,460,000
1971	320,000,000	158,400,000 2/
1972	320,000,000	426,600,000 3/
1973	360,000,000	270,200,000
1974	360,000,000	270,200,000

* Up until FY 1972, the CWS Fiscal Year appropriation was used to fund program operations during the calendar year. With FY 1972, the program became one full year forward-funded.

1/ The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorized a lump sum of $412,500,000 for three youth programs including College Work-Study.

2/ Actual funds available for CWS in this year amounted to $199,700,000, including reprogrammed funds.

3/ Includes $244,600,000 forward funding for FY 1973, plus a supplemental of $25,600,000. A total of $237,400,000 was available for use during FY 1972 from a combination of FY 1971 and FY 1972 appropriations.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The main object of the College Work-Study program (CWS) is to promote the part-time employment of students. Employment may be made available only to those students who need such earnings to pursue a course of study at an eligible college or university. Employment may be for the institution itself (except in the case of a proprietary institution of higher education), or for a public or private non-profit organization and in the public interest. Students may work up to forty hours per week during a semester or other term when their classes are in session as well as during vacation periods, such as the summer.

Grants are made to higher education institutions for partial reimbursement of wages paid to students. Since August 1968, these Federal grants have covered 80 percent of the student wages, with the remainder paid by the institution, the employer of the student, or some other donor.

Two percent of each year's appropriation is reserved for Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The rest is allotted among the 50 States and the District of Columbia on the basis of the number of each, compared with the total in all 51 states, of (a) full-time higher education students, (b) high school graduates, and (c) related children under 18 years of age living in families with incomes of less than $3,000. Allocations to institutions within a State are based on approved applications.

Office of Education strategy is to provide CWS funds as an additional source of supplemental financial assistance to needy students. Need is indicated by application of a needs analysis in which other sources of income and financial aid are taken into account.

Program Scope:

During Academic Year 1973-74, approximately 3,000 institutions of higher education will participate in the CWS program enabling some 560,000 students to find part-time employment. The average annual student wage, including the institutional matching share, amounted to an estimated $580, per student.

Complete program information for academic year 1973-74 is not yet available, however, during the 1972-73 academic year, approximately 2,700 institutions participated in the program, enabling some 545,000 students to find part-time employment. It is estimated that 38% of the funds were distributed to public universities, 8% went to other public four-year institutions, 18% went to public two-year schools, private universities received 13 of the funds, other four-year private institutions received 15%, private two-year or less schools received 6%, and public vocational-technical schools received 2%

Of the students who received CWS benefits in Academic 1972-73, an estimated 96.0% were undergraduate and 4.0% were graduate students. It is estimated that 27.4% of the students aided had gross family income of less than $2,999; 29.3% had family income of $3,000 to $5,999; 14.8%, $6,000 to $7,499; 11.2%, $7,500 to $8,999; and 17.3% were from families with incomes higher than $9,000[1]. Estimated ethno-racial characteristics of Work-Study loan recipients were: Black, 20.7%; American Indian, .5%; Oriental American, 1.1%; Spanish-Surnamed, 4.0%; and Other, 73.7%.

---

[1] - Gross income is defined as total family income for dependent students and students' and Spouses' income (the latter if appropriate) for independent students.

For FY 1972, panels approved $305,707,000 in institutional requests, as compared with $237,400,000 actually available for distribution to schools.

Program Effectiveness:

Results from an evaluation of the College Work-Study Program by the Bureau of Applied Social Research show that when compared with the national (ACE) norms for entering freshmen, CWS freshmen constitute a group from a distinctly lower socio-economic background. These CWS students (studied during Academic Year 1970-71) have proportionately almost three times as many students from minority backgrounds as the ACE group. Fifty-five percent of the CWS students that year came from families with annual incomes of less than $6,000. The study found that six out of ten institutions reported that their 1970-71 funding allocation was inadequate to provide employment for all eligible students.

Fifty-six percent of CWS students estimated they would earn over $500 from their CWS job and nearly 60 percent said their total financial aid package would be over $1,000. Almost one third of these CWS students were the first in their families to attend college, even if they had older brothers and sisters. Nearly 20 percent said they would not have been able to go to college if CWS had not been available to them (34 percent of the black students stated this), while another 7 percent would have been forced to attend a less expensive school. On the other hand, almost half said that all the financial aid they could expect, plus their parents' contribution if any, would not be enough to cover their basic college expenses. CWS students made up the difference from various sources, including savings, loans, and other jobs.

The contractor also asked institutions to describe both good effects and problems with CWS on their own campuses. Over 80 percent of the schools said that the CWS program had enabled them to bring in more students from low-income families and to create job opportunities on campus. An even larger percentage, when asked about the non-financial effects of CWS on students, responded that they felt CWS had helped students develop a more positive attitude toward work and responsibility and also to develop knowledge and working skills which might be useful in their careers. Only one percent of the schools said they felt CWS left students with too little time for their studies. (Twenty-five percent of the students, however, felt a possible disadvantage of CWS was too little time for studying.) Almost 70 percent of the CWS administrators believe the CWS program to be very successful on their own campus and over 80 percent would definitely expand their CWS program if additional funds were available.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation is currently engaged in feasibility and design efforts directed towards the preparation of a new study which will attempt to assess the impact of all OE-sponsored student assistance programs.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Applied Social Research, The Federal College Work-Study Program: A State Report, Fiscal Year 1971. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1973.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Higher Education. Factbook 1972. Washington, D.C.: 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Cooperative Education Program

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
P.L. 90-575, Title I, 82 Stat. 1030, (20 U.S.C. 1087b) included in the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended, Title IV, Part D.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	*	$ 1,540,000
	1971	*	1,600,000
	1972	$10,750,000	1,700,000
	1973	10,750,000	10,750,000
	1974	10,750,000	10,750,000

* One percent of the College Work-Study appropriation was authorized to be used in support of cooperative education programs at higher education institutions.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Under this program, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to award grants for the planning, establishment, expansion or carrying out of cooperative education programs in higher education institutions. In addition, grants or contracts are authorized for the training of persons in the planning, establishment, administration, and coordination of such programs and research into methods of improving, developing, or promoting the use of cooperative education programs in institutions of higher education. Cooperative education is defined as alternate periods of full-time study and full-time public or private employment related to a student's academic course of study (or his career objectives).

The objective of the cooperative education program is to increase the number of opportunities for students at institutions to obtain both an education and worthwhile work experience which helps finance their education. Federal support for such programs at colleges and universities is designed to encourage institutions which do not have such programs to determine the feasibility of establishing them. Other institutions which have planned for such programs and desire to implement them may use grant funds for this purpose, and those which plan to expand or strengthen existing programs may receive support.

Under the Cooperative Education program, grants are awarded to institutions on a proposal basis, with an institution eligible to receive grants for three years. Awards cannot exceed $75,000 and funds must not be used as compensation for student employment. Salaries and other administrative expenses for cooperative education administrators are payable from grant funds.

The students' work experience should in as far as possible closely correlate with and enrich their on-campus experiences. Employers of students pay them commensurate with their productivity and the extent to which they are capable of assuming job responsibilities. In many instances the compensation students receive while employed is their major source of support in continuing and completing their academic programs. The institutions of higher education assume the responsibility for assigning the student to a job relevant to his academic program and providing supervision during the work period. In addition, the student's job performance is evaluated by the institution. In many cases academic credit is given for the work experience, and in others the kind and extent of work experience is recorded on the transcript.

Program Scope:

In FY 1973 the program was funded for the first time at the authorized level of $10,750,000--an increase of 632 percent over the 1972 level of $1,700,000. This expansion in funding reflects the administration's interest in career education.

Institutions submitted 642 proposals. Three hundred fifty five of these were acted on favorably. Of these, 277 were awarded to institutions which were first time recipients.

Program Effectiveness:

While the number of Cooperative Education programs has increased significantly in the last decade or so* from 35 in 1960 to more than 350 in 1973, the contribution the federal program has made to this growth is difficult to assess in view of the small appropriations prior to FY 1973.

*K. Patricia Cross, The Integration of Learning and Earning: Cooperative Education and Nontraditional Study, ERIC/Higher Education Research Report, Washington, D. C. ACE 1973.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A modest evaluation study is planned for FY 1974.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education. January 1972.
BHE Budget Data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Guaranteed Student Loan Program

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Title IV-B, Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; Public Law 89-329, as amended; Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969; Public Law 91-95 as amended.	Varies according to provisions.

Funding History:

Year	Loan Volume	Obligations 1/	Appropriation 1/
1966	$ 77,492,000 2/	$ -	$ 10,450,000 2/
1967	249,235,000 2/	21,308,000	44,800,000 2/
1968	459,377,000 2/	43,156,000	43,600,000 2/
1969	686,676,000	48,559,000	74,900,000
1970	839,666,000	112,202,050	62,400,000
1971	1,043,991,000	147,512,000	143,200,000
1972	1,301,577,000	197,813,000	196,600,000
1973	1,198,523,000	239,609,000	245,000,000
1974	1,050,000,000	310,000,000	310,000,000 (est.)

1/ Includes: advances for reserve funds, expenditures for interest payments, death and disability claims, and special allowance. Costs for computer services are not included.

2/ Includes loans primarily carried under Vocational Education.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Program is to provide loans for students attending nearly 4,300 eligible institutions of higher education and nearly 3,900 vocational, technical, business and trade schools.

The principal of the loan is provided by participating lending institutions such as commercial banks, savings and loan association, credit unions, insurance companies, pension funds, and eligible educational institutions. The loan is guaranteed by a State or private non-profit agency or insured by the Federal government.

Loan programs are nearly equally divided between those insured by States and reinsured (80 percent) by the Federal government and those directly insured by the Federal government. A student is eligible if he is enrolled and in good standing or accepted for enrollment at least half time at an eligible institution and is a United States citizen or is in the United States for other than a temporary purpose. The maximum loan per academic year is $2,500 with a maximum outstanding of $7,500 for undergraduate students and $10,000 for graduate students including undergraduate loans. Students may apply for Federal interest benefits by submitting to the lender a recommendation by the educational institution as to the amount needed by the student to meet his educational costs. After considering the recommendation, the lender will determine the amount of the loan. For students found eligible for interest benefits, the Federal government will pay to the lender the total interest due prior to the beginning of the repayment period. Students not eligible for Federal interest benefits may still apply for a loan but will have to pay their own interest. The student pays the total interest at an annual percentage rate of 7% during the repayment period which begins 9-12 months after graduation or withdrawal from school. Deferments are allowed for return to school as a full-time student and up to three years for military service, Peace Corps, or VISTA. Minimum repayment period generally five years, maximum ten years. Maximum loan period is fifteen years.

A special allowance is authorized to be paid to lenders when the Secretary determines that economic conditions are impeding or threatening to impede the fulfillment of the purposes of the Program and that the return to the lender is less than equitable. The rate which is determined quarterly may not exceed 3% per annum on the average quarterly balance of principal loans outstanding on or after August 1, 1969.

Lender Participation (as of 1/15/74)

Type of Lender	Number	Percent of Lenders
National Banks	7,821	34.8
State Banks	9,145	40.7
Mutual Savings Banks	471	2.1
Savings & Loan	1,791	8.0
Credit Unions	2,829	12.6
Direct Loan Programs	4	0.0
Other	410	1.8
TOTAL	22,471	100.0

Program Scope:

In Fiscal Year 1973, 19,177 institutions were approved for lending, and 559,085 Federal loans as well as 469,628 State and other loans totalling 1,088,286 were insured. The total amount of loan approvals was $1,198,523,000 with $654,616,000 being Federal and $535,584,000 being State and other loans. The amount of the average loan was $1,101. One State received reserve fund advances during FY 1973. The FISLP is operating in 28 States on a Statewide basis.

Of the total obligation amount, $239,483,000 went to interest benefits, special allowance payments, and death and disability payments on insured loans, $126,000 went to reserve fund advances, and $64,258,000 was for the Student Loan Insurance Fund for the payment of claims.

Program Effectiveness:

Program effectiveness can be partially measured by indicating the distribution of loans among different income backgrounds. These distributions can be compared with those of other student assistance programs which are, by design, targeted to students from lower income families.

In FY 1972, 11.8% of the students (both dependent and independent) aided were from families with gross income less than $3,000, 16.2% were from families with income between $3,000 and $5,999, 8% had family income between $6,000 and $7,499, 9.8% had income of $7,500 to $8,999, 18.4% were from families with income between $9,000 and $11,999, 16.3% had family income of between $12,000 and $14,999 and 19.5 were from families with income over $14,999. [1] The percent distribution of loans approved by ethno-racial category was 17.2% Black: .7% American Indian; .8% Oriental American; 2.5% Spanish Surnamed American; 73.9% Caucasian. 62.1% of the borrowers are in the normal undergraduate age range of 18-23 but 34.5% are in the 24-35 age group, indicating substantial use of guaranteed loans by graduate students and adults resuming their education. The distribution of loans by academic status is 57.6% for freshmen - sophomore students, and 38.3% for upperclassmen and graduate students. Even though Blacks constitute only 6.9% of the total undergraduate population, 17.1% of all GSL borrowers are black. Finally, nearly 2 out of 3 borrowers are male.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation:

The Office of Education is currently monitoring two projects primarily designed to provide more information about the default process. The first project is the development of a Loan Estimation Model by Systems Group, Inc. This forecasting model will make use of historical loan data and past trends in order to predict claims, interest benefits, and premium income for several years in the future. The second project is a Survey of Lenders and Borrowers by Resources Management Corp. Twin surveys will examine lender policies, practices, and procedures in the loan repayment process and will examine the perceptions of borrowers about their loan repayment obligations.

The Loan Estimation Model will be operational by June 30, 1974. The Lender-Borrower Survey will be completed by September 30, 1974.

---

[1] Gross income is defined as total family income for dependent students and students' and spouses' income (the latter if appropriate) for independent students.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Higher Education, *Factbook, 1972*. Washington, D. C.: 1972.

Lybrand, Ross Brothers and Montgomery. *Survey of Lender Practices Relating to the Guaranteed Student Loan Program*. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

National Direct Student Loan Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date
Title IV, Part E of the HEA 1965 Public Law 89-329, as amended[1]	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization[2]	Appropriation[3]
	1966	$ 179,300,000	$181,550,000
	1967	190,000,000	192,000,000
	1968	225,000,000	193,400,000
	1969	210,000,000	193,400,000
	1970	325,000,000	195,460,000
	1971	375,000,000	245,000,000
	1972	375,000,000	293,000,000 [4]
	1973	400,000,000	585,970,000
	1974	400,000,000	286,000,000

[1] Authorization for contribution to loan funds only. In addition, a total of $25,000,000 was authorized for loans to institutions from Fiscal Year 1959 through the duration of the Act.

[2] Appropriation includes contributions to loan funds, loans to institutions and Federal payments to repay the institutional share of cancellations.

[3] Prior to FY 1973, the program was known as the National Defense Student Loan Program.

[4] Includes $23,600,000 forward funded for use during FY 1973.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Program is to fund postsecondary institutions for the purpose of making long-term, low-interest loans to students with financial need. Such loans complement other forms of student financial assistance such as Basic and Supplement educational opportunity grants, college work-study, and insured student loans.

Funding is initially allocated to States by means of a special allotment formula. Funding levels for institutions within each State are decided by regional review panels consisting of OE Program Officers from the regional and national offices and financial aid officers selected from institutions in that region. Panel approved requests are generally in excess of the annual NDSL allocation for a State. In such cases, the entire group of institutions within a State receives less than 100 percent of their panel approved amount. However, each institution within that group receives a pro-rated reduction in its allocation which, in percentage, is equal to that of every other institution in the State. Institutions often distribute NDS loans in conjunction with other forms of financial aid and financial aid officers hold different views of how to "package" these various aid components. Students may borrow a total of: (a) $2,500 if they are enrolled in a vocational program or if they have completed less than two years of a program leading to a bachelor's degree; (b) $5,000 if they are undergraduate students and have already completed two years of study toward a bachelor's degree (this total includes any amount borrowed under the NDSL for the first two years of study); (c) $10,000 for graduate study (this total includes any amount borrowed under the NDSL for undergraduate study). Upon leaving the institution, students sign a repayment agreement which specifies the duration and amount of repayment. After a nine month grace period following cessation of studies, the student begins repayment (on a monthly, bimonthly, or quarterly basis) over a ten year period. The borrower's ten year repayment period may be deferred not to exceed three years for service with Vista, the Peace Corps, or military service.

Program Scope

In Fiscal Year 1972, 2,186 institutions received contributions to loan funds, while an estimated 372,800 first time recipients and 241,400 continuing recipients, for a total of 614,200 students, were aided with loans. The average loan per student was an estimated $670. It is estimated that 39.2% of the funds distributed went to public universities, 6.5% went to other four-year public institutions, 8.0% went to two-year public schools, 19.2% was received by private universities, 17.1% by other four-year private institutions and 2.2 was received by private two-years and 7.5% by proprietary institutions. The loans to institution programs aided 81 institutions in FY 1972. Loan cancellations of 10% were received by an estimated 68,000 new borrowers and 100,000 continuing borrowers in 1972. It is estimated that over 42,000 new and 30,000 continuing borrowers received cancellations of 15%. The total number of borrowers who received cancellations was estimated 240,000 in 1972. Loan applications from institutions are about 15% in excess of final panel-approved amounts. Panel-approved amounts have typically exceeded actual program appropriations by about 40%.

Program Effectiveness

Program effectiveness can be partially measured by analysis of the distributions of family incomes of borrowers. Since an important objective of this legislation is to make these loans available to students having the greatest financial need, an important goal of the Program is to encourage distribution of such loans to those from lower and lower middle income families.

Of the students aided (both dependent and independent), an estimated 93.7% were undergraduate and 6.3% were graduate students. It is estimated that 22.2% of the students aided were from families with gross income less than $2,999; 25.8% had family income of $3,000 to $5,999; 13.9%, $6,000 to $7,499; 12.1%, $7,500 to $8,999; and 26% had family income of $9,000 or more. These distributions include dependent and independent students. The estimated percentage distribution of students who received loans by ethnoracial category was: Black, 16.5%; American Indian, 3%; Oriental American, .8%; Spanish-surnamed American, 3.2%; and Caucasian, 79.2%. These distributions would appear to indicate that NDSL loans are, in fact, going primarily to lower-income students.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies

An evaluation study conducted by Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey, is scheduled for completion in April 1974. This study will provide detailed data on student assistance "packages" and will specific function of NDS loans as part of those packages. The study will also provide information on the administrative staffing of the NDSL program at over 1500 colleges and universities and the billing and collection efforts being made by these institutions.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Higher Education. Factbook, 1972. Washington, D. C., 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Upward Bound Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV-A Section 408; Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-230; as amended by Public Law 92-318.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	*	*
	1966	*	*
	1967	*	*
	1968	*	*
	1969	*	*
	1970	$29,600,000 1/	$29,600,000
	1971	30,061,000 1/	30,061,000
	1972	32,669,000 1/	32,669,000
	1973	100,000,000 1/	38,331,000
	1974	100,000,000 1/	38,331,000

* There were no specific authorizations or appropriations for Upward Bound during these years. This was an OEO agency allocation made from the total appropriations of Title II-A of the Economic Opportunity Act.

1/ Represents budget authority. Beginning in FY 1970 funds authorized were combined for the three programs of Special Services, Upward Bound, and Talent Search. (A total of $100,000,000 is authorized for the three programs in FY 1973.)

Program Purpose and Operation:

Upward Bound is designed for the low-income high school student who, without the program, would not have considered college or other post-secondary school enrollment nor would he have been likely to have gained admission to and successfully completed a two- or four-year college or other post-secondary school. In a typical year an Upward Bound student is a resident on a college, university, or secondary school campus for a six- to eight-week summer session. In the academic year he may attend Saturday classes or tutorial/counseling sessions or participate in cultural enrichment activities. During his junior and senior years he explores many options for the post-secondary preparation and program best suited to his needs.

Upward Bound looks for the individual who has a demonstrated aptitude for a career which demands post-secondary education but whose faulty preparation prevents him from meeting conventional criteria for admission to a college, university, or technical institute. It is designed to generate skills by means of remedial instruction, altered curriculum, tutoring, cultural exposure and encouragement so that the goal of Upward Bound, admission and success in higher education, can be achieved.

Upward Bound programs may include cooperative arrangements among one or more colleges and universities and secondary schools. High school students enrolled in these programs receive stipends of up to $30 per month. Federal financial assistance for these programs may not exceed $1,400 per student. Average Federal cost per student in FY 1972 was $994.

Programs include (1) coordination, where feasible, of Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Special Services for Disadvantaged Students; (2) increased attention to students in cultural and geographic isolation; (3) projects to overcome motivational and academic barriers to acceptance at, and success in, a two- or four-year college or other post-secondary school.

Program Scope:

Recent Census data reveals that there are about 1,800,000 students in high school from poor families (less than $3,000 family income), and near-poor families (less than $5,000 family income). These 1,800,000 students constitute the upper limit of the Upward Bound target population. Census and other data also show that for the high school graduates of this low-income group, about 35 percent are entering college.

About 55 percent of all high school graduates are now entering college eventually. This rate includes the many high school graduates who enter college later than the same year of high school graduation ("delayed entrants") as well as the high school graduates who enter college in the year of high school graduation. Therefore, if low-income high school graduates (up to $5,000 family income) are to enroll in college at the same rate as all high school graduates, an additional 20 percent of low-income quartile high school graduates must complete high school and enroll in college. Since about 35 percent of the low-income quartile students enter college on their own, Upward Bound must concentrate on attracting the 20 percent who are not in order to obtain national parity. This 20 percent of the 1,800,000 low-income high school students constitutes, therefore, the target population of Upward Bound. Upward Bound, consequently, must get about 360,000 (.20 x 1,800,000) of this four-year high school cohort of students through high school and into college if the college entrance rate for high school graduates from families with incomes below $5,000 is to equal the college entrance rate for all families. (Available statistics do not yet permit a similar analysis for non-collegiate post-secondary school attendance.)

In FY 1973, 416 Upward Bound projects were funded, 53 new projects and 363 continuing projects, with an average grant of $92,000. This includes the additional emphasis within Upward Bound given to veterans provided by supplemental funding. Numbers of students aided by Upward Bound in FY 1973 are not yet available, but in FY 1972, including veterans, the program aided 33,809 students, 10,962 new and 22,847 continuing, with over 8,000 of these students graduating from high school in that year. About 80 percent of the graduates planned to attend college or other post-secondary institutions.

Program Effectiveness:

Program effectiveness can be measured in part by determining whether Upward Bound participants have a better college enrollment and retention rate than the norm for their income group. A chart follows showing Upward Bound college entrance and retention rates, and the rates for a national sample of high school graduates. The rates for the low-income members of this national sample are also shown.*

The table includes the statistics on educational outcomes of former Upward Bound students as reported in the General Accounting Office's study of Upward Bound--see rows 4 and 5 (draft report dated 8-30-73). The statistics for the high school class of 1966 include only those members who completed high school, but the Upward Bound statistics, except for the last row, are for all former Upward Bound students whether they completed high school or not. By inspection of the table, it is apparent that Upward Bound enrolls a much larger proportion of its students in college compared to the class of 1966. Upward Bound, however, has not been as successful in graduating as many from two-year and four-year colleges as have graduated from the class of 1966. This outcome must be seen in light of two additional facts: (1) a large proportion of former Upward Bound students are still enrolled in college; (2) Upward Bound students, more than two-thirds of whom are members of racial and ethnic minority groups, typically are "high-risk" students, whereas those low-income members of the high school class of 1966 are mostly white students and contain only a small proportion of high-risk students. High-risk students also usually take longer to proceed through college than do "modal" students.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

A new evaluation of the Upward Bound program has been commissioned by the Office of Education; this contract extends from July 1973 to December 30, 1974.

The prime objective of this study is to determine how effectively students utilize these programs, what program methods are most effective, and what improvements can be made in the administration of the programs in light of these findings. In short, are these programs meeting their goals, and are the programs truly necessary?

---

* The high school graduate class of 1966 was used because it is the latest year available for which adequate follow-up data exists through the college years.

Another major purpose of this evaluation is to see if students who participate truly require the services these programs provide--or whether the participants would have entered and survived in college without the assistance of the programs.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program Data:

Census of Population 1970: Detailed Characteristics Final Report PC(1)-D1 U.S. Summary, Table 267; 1970 number of students enrolled in high school with income below the poverty level in 1969; as used in the preliminary design for the ongoing evaluation of the Upward Bound program.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 222, "School Enrollment: October 1970," derived from tables 14 and 15, and unpublished data obtained from the Bureau of the Census.

Sources to Table

"High School Class of 1966 (rows 1 and 2)"

From a national probability sample of the high school class of 1966. The data were originally collected in October 1965 and there have been several follow-up surveys. The educational outcomes used here were collected in the fourth follow-up survey in winter-spring 1971. Data are collected by the Census Bureau for the study. A. J. Jaffe and Walter Adams, "1971-72 Progress Report and Findings: Follow-up of a Cross-section of 1965-66 High School Seniors," Progress Report to the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, New York, July 1972, processed. The statistics are repercentaged from Tables 1a, 1b, and 10b.

"Former Upward Bound Students" and "Entrants to Upward Bound in 1966 (rows 3 and 4)." Data from the General Accounting Office's report on the Upward Bound Program, pp. 13 and 22.

"Upward Bound Completions in 1966, (row 5)." From the 1973 Upward Bound Post-Secondary Report, October 16, 1973, Division of Student Assistance, U.S. Office of Education, national summary table.

A COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES OF FORMER UPWARD BOUND PARTICIPANTS COMPARED WITH COHORTS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1966 1/

Outcomes 2/ Initial Group	(1) High School Graduates	(2) College Entrants (2÷1)	(3) College Graduates (3÷2)	(4) Currently Enrolled in College (4÷2)	(5) Graduated or Currently Enrolled (3+4)÷2	(6) Dropouts (6÷2)	(7) Proportion of School Graduat to College Graduates & Currently Enro in College (5÷1)
High School Class of 1966 N=1, 013 100%	1,013 (100%)	553 (55%)	250 (45%)	116 (21%)	366 (66%)	187 (34%)	36%
High School Class of 1966; income less than $5,000 N=225 100%	225 (100%)	77 (34%)	24 (31%)	19 (25%)	43 (56%)	34 (44%)	19%
Former Upward Bound Students N=71, 567 100%	50,366 (70%)	35,431 (70%)	996 (3%)	20,261 (57%)	21,257 (60%)	14,174 (40%)	42%
Entrants to Upward Bound in 1966 N=14, 394 100%	12,710 (88%)	8,988 (71%)	671 (7.5%)	2,381 (26.5%)	3,052 (34%)	5,936 (66%)	24%
Upward Bound Completion in 1966 N=908 100%	908 (100%)	552 (61%)	197 (36%)	30 (5%)	227 (41%)	325 (59%)	25%

1/ Percentages in Column 2 are based on division by the number of graduates in Column 1. Percentages in Columns 3-6 are based on division by the number of college entrants in Column 2. Column 7 is based on the division of Column 5 by Column 1.

2/ Read across for each "Initial Group" for comparative outcomes, i.e., college enrollment and retention among groups and down for identification of cohort.

Sources: See previous page.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Talent Search Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV-A, Section 408, Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-230; as amended by Public Law 92-318.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	*	$2,000,000
	1967	*	2,500,000
	1968	*	4,000,000
	1969	$4,000,000	4,000,000
	1970	5,000,000 1/	5,000,000
	1971	5,000,000 1/	5,000,000
	1972	5,000,000 1/	5,000,000
	1973	100,000,000 1/	6,000,000
	1974	100,000,000 1/	6,000,000

* Such sums as may be necessary

1/ Represents budget authority. Beginning in FY 1970 funds authorized were combined for the three programs of Special Services, Upward Bound, and Talent Search. A total of $100,000,000 is authorized for the three programs in FY 1974.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Talent Search is a project grant program which works through institutions of higher education, and public and private agencies and organizations to provide services to low-income youth from the seventh through twelfth grades. The ultimate goal of this program is to equalize educational opportunities for low-income students through: (1) identification and encouragement of qualified youth of financial or cultural need; (2) publication of existing forms of student financial aid; and (3) encouragement of secondary-school or college dropouts of demonstrated aptitude to reenter educational programs including post-secondary school programs.

The Commissioner may enter into contracts with or award grants to institutions of higher education, combinations of institutions of higher education, and public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations. Grants are limited to $100,000 per year and funding selections are made on the basis of program proposals submitted by eligible parties on or before a date set by the Commissioner.

Program Scope:

The 1970 decennial census reveals that there are about 3.2 million 14 to 24 year olds, enrolled and not enrolled in school, with 1 to 4 years of high school with income below the poverty level. This group constitutes the broad target population for Talent Search. Even if the Talent Search target population were to be limited to the top two ability quartiles within the low income quartile, the Talent Search universe of need would still be 918,000.

There are, also, a large number of newly released veterans over 21 years old who need the services of Talent Search. Coupled with high unemployment rates among the 800,000 to 1,000,000 servicemen who return to Civilian life each year is an education pattern reflected in the following statistics:

> 20 to 25% of Vietnam veterans have had less than a high school level of education; 15% have completed some college work.
>
> 20 to 25% of Vietnam veterans received combat training only and are returning to Civilian life inadequately prepared for employment.

In FY 1973, Talent Search continued to direct services to these veterans.

Program Effectiveness:

During academic year 1972-73 (FY 1973), services were provided to about 103,000 young people from grades seven through twelve, plus 16,000 veterans. About 31,000 were placed in post-secondary education compared with 29,000 in the previous academic year. Almost 10,000 veterans were placed in post-secondary education. In addition, more than 4,000 dropouts, and 2,100 veterans, were persuaded to return to school or college. About 7,300 were enrolled in high school equivalency programs--split almost evenly between veterans and non-veterans. 166 projects were funded with the $6 million appropriation in FY 1973; 62 of these projects concentrated on veterans.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of both the Talent Search and Upward Bound Programs has been commissioned. The contract extends from July 1973 to December 30, 1974.

Objectives of the Talent Search study are to perform a descriptive analysis of the operations of the program, to assess its impact and effectiveness, and to recommend improvements in the program's administration.

Another major purpose of this evaluation is to see if students who participate in the programs truly require these services--or whether the participants would have entered and survived in college without the assistance of the programs.

The study will involve two phases: A design phase and a data collection and analysis phase. Surveys of program participants and former participants will be required, along with post-high school follow-up surveys. The study may require development and survey of a comparison group. Required will be assessment of program participants' characteristics, their post-high school activities, and the degree to which the programs have met participants' needs for counselling, academic skills development, and placement in post-secondary education.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.
U.S. Census of Population 1970: Detailed Characteristics Final Report PC(1)-D1 U.S Summary, Tables 267 and 268; as used in the preliminary design for the Talent Search evaluation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Services for Disadvantaged Students

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV Part A, Section 408; Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-230; as amended by Public Law 92-318.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
	1970	$ 10,000,000	$10,000,000
	1971	15,000,000	15,000,000
	1972	15,000,000	15,000,000
	1973	100,000,000 1/	23,000,000
	1974	100,000,000 1/	23,000,000

1/ Represents budget authority. Beginning in FY 1970 funds authorized were combined for the three programs of Special Services, Upward Bound, and Talent Search. A total of $100,000,000 is authorized for these programs in FY 1974.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Special Services is a project grant program making awards to institutions of higher education to provide remedial and other supportive services for students with academic potential who because of educational, cultural, or economic background, or physical handicap, are in need of counseling, tutorial, or other supportive services, career guidance and placement.

Program Scope:

Recent Census data shows that there were about 1,200,000 poor and near-poor (up to $5,000 family income) eleventh and twelfth grade high school students. At least 65 percent (800,000) within this income group will be expected to graduate from high school, and about 40 percent (320,000) of the high school graduates will be expected to enter college eventually. The 320,000 low-income students, plus those physically handicapped students from families above $5,000 income, constitute the upper limit of the target population in need of special services. Evidence from the almost completed study of the special services program reveals that, in fall 1971, 14 percent of all undergraduates came from families with an income that places them within the federal government's poverty classification; this is the target population that the Special Services program focus on. Also, while about half of all colleges report enrolling 11 percent or more financially disadvantaged undergraduates, only about 25 percent of all colleges have a post-matriculation special services type program for low-income students. (Some of the other 75% provide the needed services even though they may not have an explicit program.) The principal source of support for these programs is the federal government, with only about 15 percent by regular institutional funds, and less than 10 percent by private foundations. According to the study underway, the most frequent program components found in more than six of every ten programs (from all funding sources) are academic counseling and advising, special recruiting strategy, and tutoring. About half provide for diagnosis of learning difficulty or for remedial courses, and almost half report use of special instructional media or strategies. Almost half involve cooperative effort with community agencies or organizations; about the same proportion contain job placement elements. Guidance for graduate study appears in about one in every five programs. Slightly more than half are concerned with the administration of students grants, work-study, and/or loans.

Programs funded as federal Special Services Programs tend to have a wider variety of the several components than do other programs. Also, the content of the programs appears influenced by institutional goals: i.e., selective institutions more frequently provide tutoring or guidance toward graduate study, but provide remedial courses less frequently than do nonselective institutions. Programs on traditionally white campuses differ in content from those on traditionally black campuses only in the greater frequency of recruiting components.

The program completed its third year of operation on June 30, 1972. In FY 1973, 322 projects were funded, at an average cost of $71,000 per project, serving 63,112 students. The average cost per student was about $365.

Program Effectiveness:

Program records show that in FY 1972 (program year 1972-73), more than 10,000 students participating in the Special Services program successfully completed the program: about 7,000 students showed adequate academic and personal adjustment and moved out of the program into the regular academic channels of the host institutions; more than 2,000 graduated from the host institutions, and about 1,300 left the host institutions to transfer to other colleges, and were, presumably, making satisfactory progress or transfer would not have been possible.

The ongoing evaluation of the Special Services program has shown that most of these types of programs are quite new; the average (median) of the programs reported (whether federal or non-federal supported) was 2.6 years, and only three percent had histories extending ten years or more in the past. This suggests that it is too early to evaluate program impact by numbers persevering to a bachelor's degree continuing into graduate study.

The study has also revealed that being disadvantaged is much more than a financially determined phenomenon. There are greater differences among students of different ethnic classification within the low-income group than there are between poverty-level and modal (typical) students within the same ethnic classification. Differences between physically handicapped students and modal students are relatively minor--except for the fact of the physical disability of course.

Between the poverty-level and modal students, the study did not find substantial differences by major field of study, content of freshman courses taken, or relative difficulty with such courses. Differences in academic achievement, as measured by reported college grades, did exist and were similar in pattern to the differences observed in high school grades for these two groups. The college environment, while not tending to magnify previous differences in academic achievements, does not appear to be compensating for such differences.

The poverty level students reported a higher degree of participation in the services offered by the special services programs than did the modal students. This differential participation was particularly large in professional counseling on financial problems and assistance, but was also greater for: tutoring by students and professors; professional counseling on career choices; remedial courses and courses on reading skill development; programs to improve writing and number skills; reduced course load; professional counseling for personal and academic problems, and several other elements. Exposure to these specific programmatic elements that are common to Special Services programs, as discovered by the evaluation, does improve the chances of academic success among disadvantaged students relative to modal students in the same institution. However, there was little evidence of some institutions doing better than other institutions in differentially contributing to the success of the disadvantaged student relative to the modal student peers. In regard to the poverty level students own satisfaction with academic life, these students are relatively most satisfied at four-year predominantly white institutions and relatively least satisfied at the two-year community college.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J., is conducting an evaluation study which will be completed in February 1974. This evaluation project involved a number of interrelated activities. These included (1) a survey of all U.S. institutions of higher education, to provide a census of special services type programs, numbers of students served, and costs; (2) a more intensive questionnaire survey of a sample of 120 institutions, to obtain data in some detail on programs, staff, students served, etc.; (3) visits to some thirty of these institutions, for discussions with key college staff and program directors, to observe the functioning of the program and to determine their interaction with the total education programs; (4) personal interviews with some 1,000 disadvantaged students in a subsample of some 60 of 120 institutions to look in depth at the college experience of the target population, and (5) a questionnaire survey of some 12,000 regular and disadvantaged students at the sample of 120 institutions (a) to compare the general perceptions of, and attitudes toward, the total college experience of "disadvantaged" students to that of "typical" students, and (b) to examine the academic success and the satisfaction of disadvantaged students with their progress and their evaluation of the special programmatic features available to them.

The outcome of the evaluation will be an analysis of the impact of college and program upon the student: his level of academic performance; his degree of satisfaction with a variety of aspects of life in college and with the assistance he is receiving; his knowledge and use of special program features; his aspirations and expectations for continued study; and, his adoption of general values inherent in the goals of higher education.

The study included students in the federally supported special services program as well as disadvantaged students in non-federally supported special services-type programs.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Program files

2. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 222, "School Enrollment: October 1970", derived from tables 14 and 15, and unpublished data obtained from the Bureau of the Census.

3. Programmatic Attention to "Disadvantaged" Students by Institutions of Higher Education in the United States: A Census for 1971-72, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, September 1972 (draft final report from phase one of the evaluation of the program for Special Services for Disadvanatged Students in Higher Education).

4. The Impact of Special Services Programs in Higher Education for "Disadvantaged" Students, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, April 1973 (draft final report of phase two of the evaluation of the program for Special Services for Disadvantaged Students in Higher Education).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Strengthening Developing Institutions

Legislation: Expiration Date:

Higher Education Act of 1965, Title III; Public Law 89-329, as amended.

June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	$ 55,000,000	$ 5,000,000
	1967	30,000,000	30,000,000
	1968	55,000,000	30,000,000
	1969	35,000,000	30,000,000
	1970	70,000,000	30,000,000
	1971	91,000,000	33,850,000
	1972	91,000,000	51,850,000
	1973	120,000,000	87,500,000
	1974	120,000,000	99,992,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

This program is designed to promote improvement of higher educational institutions which possess limited, but credible, capability to provide quality education. Participating institutions must satisfy broad criteria for eligibility, which include: 1) that they be public or nonprofit, 2) that they have been in existence for a minimum of five years, and 3) that they meet such other requirements and regulations as have been established by law and promulgated by the Commissioner. Assistance is provided in the form of grants (of varying sizes and duration), which are awarded competitively on the basis of realistic long-range plans for improvement and relative ratings which satisfy qualitative and quantitative criteria. Assistance is provided for improvement in the following areas: a) curriculum (basic curriculum, remedi curriculum, occupational curriculum, and other), b) faculty development (National Teaching Fellows, Professors Emeriti, in-service training, advanced graduate training, and other), c) administrative improvement (in-service training, advanc graduate training, use of outside consultants, establishment of new offices, and other), and d) student services (counseling and guidance, remedial, tutorial and psychological services, and other). Institutions may participate either as direct granteed in cooperative arrangements (bilateral) or as members of a consortium arrangement.

As an Advanced Institutional Development program under this Title (AIDP) was implemented in FY 1973 for the purpose of expediting the development of selected institutions, which have demonstrated positive trends with the Basic portion of the program. Institutions participating in the AIDP are awarded significantly larger grants and receive multi-year funding, which may extend up to five years.

Program Scope:

In FY 1973, the Basic program awarded $51,850,000 to 235 institutions--an average grant of $220,638. Of these, 116 schools are public (54 four-year and 62 two-year) and 119 are private (102 four-year and 17 two-year). One hundred thirty-seven schools are predominantly white (74 four-year and 63 two-year) and ninety-eight are predominantly black (82 four-year and 16 two-year).

The Advanced program has awarded $35,500,000 to 28 institutions--an average grant of $1,267,857. Of these, 13 schools are public (5 four-year and 8 two-year) and 15 are private (12 four-year and 3 two-year). Fifteen schools are predominantly white (4 four-year and 11 two-year) and thirteen are predominantly black (all of which are four-year schools).

Program Effectiveness:

Findings of an evaluation study suggest that:

1. Institutional development may be better viewed as a sequential process, during which institutions pass from one stage of development to another--each of which exhibits a particular set of needs. The amounts and types of funding should be correlated with each institution's stage of development.

2. The size of a grant is not necessarily as significant upon impact as are continuity of funding and the quality of leadership. A lower level of continuous funding may be more productive than patterns of intermittant, but higher, funding (which may disrupt plans and development). Increments and decrements of funding are best instituted gradually.

3. Strong--but not authoritarian--presidential leadership is correlated with the vitality and success of programs.

4. The role of the program coordinator on most campuses was not effective; tasks were assigned to over-burdened administrators who were unable to devote sufficient time to pertinent tasks.

5. Effectiveness of some consortia was inhibited because members were either geographically distant, or significantly different in pertinent characteristics, or pursued distinctively diverse goals.

6. Use of consultants sometimes proved less beneficial than anticipated--primarily because their employ was too brief to ensure successful implementation of programs.

7. Most developing institutions are relatively unskilled with respect to internal collection and transfer of information.

8. Most successful uses of funds were for curriculum development, National Teaching Fellows, in-service training of faculty, advanced graduate training for faculty, use of outside consultants, establishment of new institutional administrative offices, and for counselling and guidance activities.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Education is currently engaged in feasibility and design studies directed towards preparing a new study which will encompass the impacts of both the Basic Program and the new Advanced Institutional Development Program.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

A Study of Title III of the Higher Education Act: The Developing Institutions Program, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education - Berkeley 1973

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Annual Interest Grants

Legislation:

Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended 1968; Title III, Section 306, Public Law 88-204.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1969	$ 5,000,000	$ 3,920,000
1970	11,750,000	11,750,000
1971	25,250,000	21,000,000
1972	38,750,000	29,010,000
1973	52,250,000	14,069,000
1974	(Such sums as may be necessary)	31,425,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to reduce the cost to institution of higher learning of obtaining private loans for construction purposes.

Loans obtained by institutions of higher education in amounts up to 90% of project development cost may be eligible for annual interest grant assistance. The annual grant made under this program covers the difference between annual debt service which would result from a 3 percent loan and the debt service actually obtained. Not more than 12 1/2 percent of the appropriation for the year may be used in any one State.

Program Scope:

In FY 1973 137 grants totalling $3.7 million were approved supporting approximately $200 million in construction loans. Of these amounts, 101 grants totalling $2.6 million supporting loans of $155 million were awarded to aid in the construction of public community colleges, developing institutions and institutions enrolling 20 percent or more students from low-income families.

Program Effectiveness:

The program has been targeted to those institutions having the greatest need and serving the greatest number of disadvantaged students but this strategy has not been completely successful. In general, colleges with the greatest need for help have poor credit ratings and are least able to avail themselves of the help provided in this program.

To remedy this situation a small amount of direct loan funds have been available to assist those institutions which have been unable to obtain commercial loans.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

An evaluation of facilities' needs and program impact is being made by Froomkin, Inc. under contract to OPBE. The report entitled, The Demand for Facilities in the Post-Secondary Sector, 1975-1990 should be available in early 1974.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Higher Education

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended; Title I; Section 103, 104 Public Law 88-204; Public Law 89-329; 20 U.S.C. 701 as amended by Higher Education Amendments of 1972.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$230,000,000	$230,000,000
1966	460,000,000	458,000,000
1967	475,000,000	453,000,000
1968	728,000,000	400,000,000
1969	936,000,000	83,000,000
1970	936,000,000	76,000,000
1971	936,000,000	43,000,000
1972	50,000,000	43,000,000
1973	200,000,000	No appropriation
1974	300,000,000	-

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to provide grants to higher education institutions to finance the construction, rehabilitation and improvement of undergraduate facilities.

Funds for public community colleges and public technical institutes under this program are allotted to each state by a formula based on the number of high school graduates and per capita income of residents. Funds for other institutions are allotted to each state by a formula based on the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education and the number of students in grades 9 through 12. Within each state, federal grants may be awarded for up to 50 percent of the project development cost. Twenty four percent of funds appropriated under the Title are reserved for community and technical colleges and schools.

Grants are not given for facilities for which admission is normally charged, for facilities used for sectarian instruction, for facilities for schools of the health professions as defined in the Higher Education Facilities Act. or for residential, dining, and student union purposes.

The law requires each state to set up a state Commission for Higher Education Facilities. This Commission determines priorities and the federal share within the state for each project submitted.

Program Scope:

While there was no appropriation for this program, a very few grants were made with recovered funds for FY 1972.

In FY 1973 seven grants totalling $1,978,000 were made to seven institutio 2 of the institutions were public community colleges which received 2 grants totalling $377,000. The other five grants went to four-year institutions.

Program Effectiveness:

In the 1960's, the total number of students in higher education increased by 3 million. HEFA, passed in 1963, made a significant contribution in providing the needed additional academic facilities. That need is now substantially filled and it is anticipated that private funding can accomodate whatever need there is for new construction. Preliminary data in the report, The Demand for Facilities in the Post-Secondary Sector, 1975 to 1990 indicate there is no overall need for additional construction though it may be very desirable in a few isolated places.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of facilities' need and program impact is being done by Froomkin, Inc. under contract to USOE. Final report is due in the Spring of 1974.

Sources of Education Data:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education. January 1972.
Froomkin, Joseph, The Demand for Facilities in the Post-Secondary Sector, 1975-1990.
BHE

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

State Administration and Planning

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; as amended; Title I, Section 105; Public Law 88-204.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$ 3,000,000	$ 3,000,000
1966	2,000,000	2,000,000
1967	7,000,000	7,000,000
1968	7,000,000	7,000,000
1969	7,000,000	7,000,000
1970	7,000,000	6,000,000
1971	7,000,000	6,000,000
1972	7,000,000	6,000,000
1973	--	3,000,000
* 1974	--	3,000,000

*The Higher Education Amendment of 1972 P.L. 92-318 amended Title XII of HEA of 1965 to require under certain conditions the establishment of State Post-Secondary Education Commission. These are popularly called 1202 Commissions in reference to the section of the law authorizing them. In FY 1974 money was appropriated for these commissions and not the older State commissions whose primary function was the administration of facilities program.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 requires the establishment of State commissions to develop and administer the State plan for the undergraduate facilities construction grant program. Grants are available to these commissions to cover the costs of administration of the state plans under this title, and the instructional equipment grant program under Part A of Title VI of the HEA. Under the Higher Education Amendments of 1966, grants are also available to the same commissions for comprehensive planning to study future facility needs in higher education.

Each state desiring to participate under Title I of HEFA is required to designate an existing state agency or establish a new agency which is representative of the public and of institutions of post-secondary education. The agency's plan for state participation must be approved by the Commissioner.

Program Scope:

In FY 1973, 55 states and territories received grants totalling $2.7 million. The grants ranged in size from $6,000 to $100,000. In addition to functions performed relative to Title VI and VII projects, the states also updated or developed inventories of physical facilities at post-secondary institutions, assessed the utilization rate of these facilities and re-evaluated enrollment projection studies.

Program Effectiveness:

Each State Commission employed an executive officer and staff. Competency and sophistication of these personnel naturally varied from State to State. Preliminary data from the Froomkin report, The Demand for Facilities in the Post-Secondary Sector, 1975-1990 suggested, for example, many states did not develop methodology effectively to estimate future enrollment.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Froomkin, Joseph, The Demand for Facilities in the Post-Secondary Sector, 1975-1990.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Higher Education, Division of Training and Facilities.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Language Training and Area Studies

Legislation:

National Defense Education Act of 1958. Title VI; Public Law 85-864; as amended by Public Law 88-665; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 92-318

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1964	$ 8,000,000	$ 8,000,000
	1965	13,000,000	13,000,000
	1966	14,000,000	14,000,000
	1967	16,000,000	15,800,000
	1968	18,000,000	15,700,000
	1969	16,050,000	15,450,000
	1970	30,000,000	12,850,000
	1971	38,500,000	7,170,000
	1972	38,500,000	13,940,000
	1973	50,000,000	12,500,000
	1974	75,000,000	11,333,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Programs for foreign language and area studies funded under this appropriation have four major purposes: (1) increase the nation's manpower pool of trained specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (2) provide in-service training to upgrade and update the professional knowledge and skills of existing specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (3) produce new knowledge about other nations and cultures, particularly those of the non-Western world, through research and development; and (4) develop improved curricula and effective instructional materials in foreign languages, area studies, and world affairs needed by education, government, and business.

The National Defense Education Act, Title VI, authorizes the award of grants and contracts to U.S. educational institutions, organizations, and individuals for activities conducted primarily in the United States. Program assistance includes institutional development, fellowship support, and research in foreign language, area studies, world affairs, and intercultural understanding.

Program Scope:

Recent studies of foreign language and area studies programs in the U.S. reveal the growth in the development of non-Western studies since enactment of the NDEA in 1958. Whereas in 1958, some 37 "uncommonly taught" languages were offered in U.S. universities, in 1972 approximately 85 modern foreign languages were taught at NDEA VI centers alone. A 1970 survey of foreign language enrollments reveals that while higher education registrations in most of the foreign languages traditionally taught in American higher education have been in a distinct downward trend since 1968, student enrollments in Italian, Spanish, and in over 100 of the less commonly taught languages taken collectively have increased significantly--by 12.8%, 6.7%, and 39.4%, respectively.

While enrollments in the uncommonly taught languages are increasing, total enrollments in these languages remain small. For example, in 1970 there were only 5,319 undergraduate and 796 graduate students studying Chinese, and only 12 undergraduates and 6 graduates in Vietnamese. Recent indications are that enrollments in Chinese language courses have increased.

The NDEA foreign language training and area studies program provides a means for correcting existing disciplinary and geographic imbalanaces, broadening the scope of area training, and improving and maintaining language skills.

In fiscal year 1973, $12,501,152 was available to fund 50 centers, 50 two-year undergraduate and 25 graduate programs, 1,110 graduate fellowships, and 20 research projects under NDEA Title VI.

World Area	Number of Centers	Obligations	Fall 1973 Estimated Enrollments
East Asia	8	$ 926,727	11,091
South Asia	6	551,400	4,375
Southeast Asia	3	290,919	2,061
Soviet & East Europe	8	731,986	9,937
Middle East	7	662,345	7,375
Africa	6	509,700	5,247
Latin America	6	463,313	17,244
International Studies 1/	6	502,544	4,610
TOTAL	50	$4,638,895	61,940

1/ Includes the following centers: 1 West European, 1 Canadian, 1 Pacific Islands, 1 Inner Asian, 1 International Studies, 1 Comparative Studies.

Program Effectiveness:

A review of foreign language and area studies programs in the U.S. (based on a sample of 13,000 foreign language and area studies specialists, of whom about 10,000 are college or university faculty members) has provided data on the impact of the NDEA program. A sampling of previous holders of NDEA VI fellowships showed that almost all (89.1%) of the fellows used their foreign area training in their first job. Of the Ph.D graduates, 99% were employed as language and world area specialists. The survey also indicates that the existing pool of specialists needs more focused development in certain aspects in order to achieve an upgrading of language skills. Of the world area specialists surveyed, only 25% reported that they can easily speak, read, and write a language of their area. A major factor in acquiring and maintaining proficiency in foreign languages is the opportunity to utilize the language in the country where it is in regular use.

Studies on international and intercultural education, and new curricula and instructional materials are intended for use in schools and colleges throughout the U.S. The impact of this program is suggested by a materials utilization survey which provides specific data on instructional materials for 50 different languages in 82 foreign language and area studies programs. Results of the survey show, for example, that of 24 respondent institutions engaged in teaching Chinese, 21, or 88 percent were using materials produced under National Defense Education Title VI support; of 17 programs offering instruction in Hindi, 100 percent were using National Defense Education materials; and 6 out of 7 Arabic programs similarly reported utilization of National Defense Education-supported materials.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Language and Area Studies Review, Richard D. Lambert, (published in August 1973 by the American Academy of Political and Social Science and the Social Science Research Council).

International Studies and the Social Sciences: A Survey of the Status of International/Comparative Studies and Recommendations Concerning National Needs and Priorities, James N. Rosenau (Minneapolis, Minnesota: International Studies Association, June 1971).

1970 Census of International Programs in State Colleges and Universities, American Association of State Colleges and Universities (Washington, D. C.; AASCU Studies 1971/3, August 1971).

Fall 1970 Survey of Foreign Language Registrations in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education, Modern Language Association (ADFL Bulletin, December 1971).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Fulbright - Hays Act

Legislation:

Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Section 102 (b) (6); Public Law 87-256; as amended by Public Law 87-565; as amended by Public Law 89-698.

Expiration Date:

None

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1964	1/	$1,500,000
	1965		1,500,000
	1966		2,000,000
	1967		3,000,000
	1968		3,000,000
	1969		3,000,000
	1970		2,430,000
	1971		830,000
	1972		1,323,000
	1973		1,360,000
	1974		1,360,000

1/ Indefinite, does not require specific money authorization.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Programs for foreign language and area studies funded under this appropriation have four major purposes: (1) increase the nation's manpower pool of trained specialists in foreign language and area studies, (2) provide inservice training to upgrade and update the professional knowledge and skills of existing specialists in foreign language, and area studies, (3) produce new knowledge about other nations and cultures, particularly those of the non-Western world; and (4) develop curricula and instructional materials in foreign language, and area studies, needed by education, government, and business.

Programs funded under the Fulbright-Hays Act Section 102 (b) (6) provide first-hand experience in the area of specialization, update and extend research knowledge, and maintain and improve language skills. Program assistance includes fellowships for faculty and doctoral dissertation research, group projects for research and training, and curriculum consultant services of foreign educators to improve foreign languages, area studies, and intercultural education in U. S. schools and colleges.

Program Scope:

In fiscal year 1973 this program supported 101 doctoral dissertion research fellowships, 10 group projects, 12 curriculum consultant grants, and 19 faculty research fellowships.

A recent review of foreign language and area studies programs in the U. S.[1/] demonstrated that adequate opportunities for research and study abroad are critical to improving the quality of specialist training. Over 85% of those included in the survey reported a need to increase opportunities for studying language in its natural setting. While in absolute terms there has been substantial growth in the numbers of specialists with some overseas experience, the survey reveals that on the average the depth of experience abroad is inadequate. Furthermore, although as a group the specialists have had experience in a wide range of countries, the research of a majority of the specialists has been clustered in a small number of countries. In brief, a few countries are overstudied, relatively speaking, while a large number are understudied.

Program Effectiveness:

The Fulbright-Hays programs have provided a resource for training specialists in areas of greatest need and for helping improve the caliber of training in language and area studies through research and study abroad.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

[1/] Language and Area Studies Review, Richard D. Lambert, (published in August 1973 by the American Academy of Political and Social Science and the Social Science Research Council).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name.

Community Service and Continuing Education Program

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965. Title I; Public Law 89-329; 20 U.S.C. 1001 as amended by Public Law 90-575; 20 U.S.C. 1001, 1005, 1006; as amended by Higher Education Amendments of 1972.

Expiration Date:

June 20, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$25,000,000	$10,000,000
1967	50,000,000	10,000,000
1968	50,000,000	10,000,000
1969	10,000,000	9,500,000
1970	50,000,000	9,500,000
1971	60,000,000	9,500,000
1972	10,000,000	9,500,000
1973	30,000,000	15,000,000
1974	40,000,000	14,250,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to provide grants to the States to strengthen those programs of colleges and universities which assist in the solution of community problems such as housing, transportation, health, etc. The program is administered in each State by a State agency designated by the Governor under a State plan approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The State Agency establishes priorities for its State and approves institutional proposals to be funded. Funds are provided on a 66 2/3 percent Federal and a 33 1/3 percent non-Federal basis.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1972 extended this program through fiscal year 1975 and authorized the Commissioner to reserve up to 10% of the appropriation for grants and contracts to pay up to 90% of the cost of special programs and projects designed to seek solutions to national and regional problems of technological change and environmental pollution.

Program Scope:

As of June 30, 1972, 1,074 institutions of higher education, 40 percent of those eligible, had participated in the community service and continuing education program since its inception in the fiscal year 1966. In FY 1972 more than 317,000 adults participated in the 576 programs. The projects were staffed by 3,051 faculty members, many devoting more than one half their time to the activity. Over 11,000 undergraduate and graduate students working as technical assistants, interns, and researchers served as resource personnel. One hundred twenty four off-campus learning centers enabled many adults to continue their education at convenient times and locations.

In FY 1973 funds were released June 22, 1973, for grants to states at the $15 million operating level. Because of the lateness in release of funds, the Commissioner did not exercise the option granted him by the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 to reserve 10 percent of funds for special problems. The decision to do so with FY 1974 funds has already been made.

Program Effectiveness:

The National Advisory Council has started a congressionally mandated evaluation of Title I programs. To date it has reviewed 70 projects in 13 states.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Higher Education Amendments of 1972 require the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education to review Title I programs carried out prior to July 1, 1973 to ascertain which show the greatest promise and greatest return for resources devoted to them. This is to be completed by March 31, 1975.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Higher Education Program Data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Land-Grant Colleges and Universities Program

Legislation:

Second Morrill Act of 1890, as amended; 26 Stat. 417; 7 U.S.C. 322, 323; Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended; 49 Stat. 439; Public Law 182; 7 U.S.C. 329 as amended Title IX, Sec. 506 Higher Education Amendments of 1972.

Expiration Date:

None

Funding History:	Year	Authorization*	Appropriation
	1964	14,500,000	14,500,000
	1965	14,500,000	14,500,000
	1966	14,500,000	14,500,000
	1967	14,500,000	14,500,000
	1968	14,500,000	14,500,000
	1969	14,720,000	14,550,000
	1970	14,922,000	14,720,000
	1971	14,720,000	12,680,000
	1972	14,720,000	12,600,000
	1973	15,160,000*	18,700,000
	1974	15,160,000	12,700,000

* This figure does not include the one-time appropriation of $6 million for the two newly designated land-grant colleges of Virgin Islands and Guam.

Program Purpose and Operation:

A land-grant college or university is an institution of higher learning designated by a state legislature for the benefits of the First Morrill Act of 1862 or the Second Morrill Act of 1890. The purpose of the original act was to insure the development in each state of at least one college "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts". The Second Morrill Act, the Nelson Amendment and the Bankhead-Jones Act provide for permanent annual appropriations and grants some of which are allocated on a population basis. Several amendments have designated Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam and the Virgin Islands as states for the purpose of these Acts.

Each State receives $50,000 under the Second Morrill Act. Each of these jurisdictions receives $150,000 from Bankhead-Jones funds plus an additional allotment based upon population. Grants are paid to State Treasurers. State legislatures must provide by statute for the division of funds if the state has more than one land-grant institution. No portion of the funds may be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of buildings or to the purchase of land. An annual report on the expenditure of the funds must be made by each institution to the U.S. Office of Education.

Program Scope:

In Fiscal Year 1973, 72 institutions received grants under the program. About 94 percent of the funds were used for salaries of instructors and the remainder for instructional equipment.

Program Effectiveness:

It is widely agreed that "the land-grant programs had a major impact in spreading opportunities for higher education in the Nineteenth Century."

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Higher Education, Division of College Support

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

College Teacher Fellowships

Legislation:

HEA Title IX, Part B (Replaces National Defense Education Act of 1958; Public Law 85-864; as amended; 20 U.S.C 462.)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	New Fellowships Authorized	New	Fellowships Support Continuing	Total	Appropriation
1965	3,000	3,000	3,000	6,000	$32,740,000 1/
1966	6,000	6,000	4,500	10,500	55,961,000 2/
1967	7,500	6,000	9,000	15,000	81,957,000 3/
1968	7,500	3,328	12,000	15,328	86,600,000 4/
1969	7,500	2,905	9,328	12,233	70,000,000
1970	7,500	2,370	6,233 (a)	8,603	48,813,000
1971	7,500	2,100	6,245 (b)	8,345	47,285,500
1972	7,500	0	4,650 (c)	4,650	26,910,000
1973	7,500	0	2,980 (d)	2,980	20,000,000
1974	7,500	0	880 (e)	880	5,806,000

1/ $177,000 of FY 1965 appropriations were transferred to Teacher Cancellations, NDEA II.

2/ $137,000 of FY 1966 appropriations were transferred to Teacher Cancellations, NDEA II.

3/ $1,115,000 of FY 1967 appropriations were transferred to Teacher Cancellations, NDEA II.

4/ $325,000 of FY 1968 appropriations were transferred to Teacher Cancellations, NDEA II.

(a) Includes 170 special fellowships for veterans.
(b) Includes 770 special fellowships for veterans and 200 fourth year fellowships.
(c) Includes 180 special fellowships for veterans.
(d) Includes 880 special fellowships for veterans.
(e) All 880 fellowships are special fellowships for veterans

Program Purpose and Operation:

The aim of this program is to increase the supply of well-trained college teachers and encourage the development of doctoral level education on a broad geographic basis by providing three-year fellowship support for graduate students.

This program aids graduate schools in strengthening their doctoral programs, in developing interdisciplinary programs tailored to prepare teachers in fields of emerging manpower needs, and in helping veterans, formerly on fellowships, resume their education in order to prepare for academic careers.

Each fellowship is a three-year award providing a stipend of $3,000 for each year of study and $500 per year for each dependent. In addition, a $3,000 per year educational allowance is provided to the institution for each fellow actively enrolled.

Panels of academic consultants review institutional applications and recommend specific doctoral programs at applying institutions to the Commissioner for final approval of fellowship awards.

Program Scope:

Funds budgeted for the College Teacher Fellowship Program (NDEA IV) in FY 1974 will be used to support 880 returning veterans during the 1974-75 fellowship year as the program continues to be phased out in light of existing supply of and demand for recent graduates with advanced degrees.

Program Effectiveness:

A study of the College Teacher Fellowship Program in July 1970 indicated that the program had been largely successful in promoting diversification of graduate study centers and helping fellows gain a graduate degree in a shorter average period compared with other doctoral students and at a lower attrition rate.

The changed focus of the program has made former measures of effectiveness inapplicable. However, as currently operating, the program is of direct assistance to returning veterans. It is too early to judge their completion rate. If we assume they will be comparable to that of other Fellows previously funded by the Program then three-fourths of them will be employed by institutions of higher education.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None planned

Source of Evaluation Data:

Study of NDEA, Title IV Fellowship Program, Phase II,
Bureau of Social Science Research, Washington, D. C.
July 1970.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Higher Education Personnel Fellowships

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Education Professions Development Act; Part E, Section 541, Public Law 90-35; 20 U.S.C. 461-465.	June 1975

Funding History:

Year	Total Authorization	Fellowships Appropriation
1969	$21,500,000	$2,200,000
1970	36,000,000	5,000,000
1971	36,000,000	5,000,000
1972	36,000,000	5,044,000
1973	5% or more of total	2,172,000
1974	5% or more of total	2,100,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to increase the supply of well-prepared teachers, administrators, and specialists in areas of critical need for junior-community colleges and four-year colleges and universities by providing one- and two-year fellowships for graduate level study in non-degree or advanced degree programs (other than the Ph.D. or equivalent for those planning a career in college teaching). Support is provided to: (1) programs that have a high promise for improvement over past practices in their training of higher education personnel; (2) programs that prepare personnel for the higher education needs of students from low-income families; (3) programs that train and retrain teachers, administrators, or educational specialists for junior colleges and two-year community colleges located in urban areas; (4) programs that prepare personnel in higher education who will serve in developing institutions; (5) programs that prepare administrators, including trustees, presidents, deans, department chairmen, development officers, and financial aid officers; (6) programs that provide graduate level education for women training for careers in higher education; (7) programs that are a basic combination of the above priorities and which show evidence of effective communication between faculty, students, administration, and where appropriate, local communities in the planning and implementation of the proposed program.

Institutions of higher education apply directly to the Office of Education for fellowships. Applications are reviewed by panels of faculty members and administrators who represent American higher education. Their recommendations are made to the Commissioner of Education.

Fellowship support is provided for one or two years depending on the length of the training program. Financial assistance is distributed in the following manner: $3,000 paid to students for each fellowship year; fellows are entitled to $500 during the fellowship year for each eligible dependent; the institution receives $3,000 a year for each fellow to pay for his tuition and required non-refundable fees.

In an effort to provide more flexibility in the recruitment of higher education personnel, the following strategies are being implemented on a pilot basis: (1) direct award of fellowships to two-year colleges; (2) award of fellowships to women for part-time study as recommended by the Newman Report; and (3) award of fellowships to programs which begin with the last undergraduate year.

Program Scope

Some indication of the program's reach and operation can be obtained from program funding data and a study of recent graduates respectively.

Program Funding Data

	Fiscal Year				
Output Measures	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973
Number of Institutions Participating	50	74	82	89	62
Number of Approved Programs	51	78	93	100	65
Number of Fellowships Awarded					
Total	415	960	903	912	441
(New)	(415)	(640)	470	581	(92)
(Continued)	(0)	(320)	433	331	(349)
Number of Fellowships Awarded in Training of Personnel As:					
Total	415	960	903	912	441
Teachers	(324)	(702)	651	668	(286)
Education Specialist	(68)	(183)	167	118	(44)
Administrators	(23)	(75)	85	126	(111)
Number of Fellowships Awarded to Train Personnel to Serve in:					
Total	(415)	960	903	912	441
Junior Colleges	(289)	(710)	689	725	(344)
Other Institutions	(126)	(250)	214	187	(97)
Average Yearly Amount of Fellowships	$5301	$5208	$5537	$5471	$6,500

Program Effectiveness:

A study of 253 Part E fellows who have completed their training programs at 22 colleges and universities reveals that 62 percent have accepted jobs in institutions of higher education, some in leadership positions, 19 percent are employed in elementary or secondary education, 10 percent are continuing their education, 4 percent had resigned from the program, 2 percent were in military service, and 3 percent were unemployed.

In another sample, information volunteered from eleven institutions of higher education, which have approved programs designed to prepare personnel to work with the disadvantaged, shows that approximately 76 percent of the total or 86 fellowships were awarded to members of minority groups--Blacks, Spanish-speaking Americans, American Indians, and Orientals. In addition, just under 50 percent of the total 113 fellowships reported were awarded to women.

In yet another area, approximately 13 percent of the total 903 1971-72 Part E fellowships were awarded to military veterans.

In terms of using fellowship programs as an incentive to influence able students to persue a given career, the data show that while only 20 percent of the respondents knew of the program prior to a decision of which school to attend, half of these students were clearly influenced in their choice because of this knowledge. Further, over forty percent of all fellows had modified their career plans after learning of the availability of funds.

Ongoing and Planned Studies:

No new studies planned.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Abt Associates, Inc. A Study of the Education Professions Development Act Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel. Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1973

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

EPDA, Part E Institutes

Legislation:	Expiration Date
Education Professions Development Act of 1967 as amended. Part E, Section 541 through 543; Public Law 90-35 and Public Law 90-575; 20 U.S.C. 1119b.	June 1975

Funding History:	Year	Total Authorization	Institutes Appropriation
	1969	$21,500,000	$4,700,000
	1970	36,000,000	5,000,000
	1971	36,000,000	5,000,000
	1972	36,000,000	5,000,000
	1973	10,000,000	5,132,000
	1974	15,000,000	-0-

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to train teachers, administrators, or educational specialists for higher education by providing support for institutes and short-term training programs. Emphasis is given three areas: (1) in-service training of personnel from junior and community colleges; (2) in-service training of personnel from developing institutions such as the predominantly black colleges and the small isolated four-year colleges; and (3) the training of higher education personnel to meet the needs of the increasing numbers of minority and low-income students seeking a college education. Since the Part E program began in FY 1969, most of the funds allocated under the EPDA Part E institute program have been focused on these areas of critical need.

This program provided support for in-service or pre-service training, part-time or full-time training programs of up to 12 months duration; training of college personnel in a variety of fields, including academic subject-matter areas; instructional methods and equipment, administrative skills, student personnel services, etc. Grants to the institution conducting the training cover all direct and indirect operating costs of the training program, as well as the cost of participant support.

Program Scope:

In FY 1972, $4,725,000 was awarded to institutions of higher education in support of 100 institutes and short-term training programs in 44 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. These programs provided training for approximately 7,930 higher education personnel.

In FY 1973, most of the funds were awarded to three priority areas as follows: (1) $2,013,662 (42.6%) supported programs to train junior college personnel; (2) $3,379,820 (71.5%) supported programs to train higher education personnel to serve minority and low-income students; and, (3) $2,014,192 (42.6%) supported programs to train personnel of developing institutions. These allocations to priority areas are not, however, mutually exclusive.

Since FY 1969, the first year of the Part E program, there has been an increasing emphasis on programs for junior college personnel, disadvantaged students, and developing institutions, while the trend in programs for the other (primarily for teachers in non-developing four-year colleges and universities) categories has clearly been in the direction of de-emphasis. While data are not available to assess the long-term impact of this program, it is evident that the EPDA Part E institutes program has focused on the national priorities the program was designed to address.

Program Effectiveness:

A 1972 study by Abt Associates gathered data on higher education personnel training needs from Presidents and five types of administrators at 60 two- and four-year colleges.

Information was collected and developed by means of a three-faceted approach: (1) a survey of 60 randomly selected undergraduate institutions; (2) a profiling system for synthesis and organization of EPDA V-E programs, and (3) a set of case studies, reflecting new trends in higher education.

Of the 1,734 participants who responded to the questionnaire, 403 (20%) were from minority background and 554 (32%) were female. Over 90% of the respondents intended to pursue higher education careers. The institutes in general were highly rated by participants with the special projects being especially well received.

Institutional leaders for both the institute and fellowship programs reported the greatest need for training in human relations skills, followed by training in dealing with current special problems, people management skills, further academic studies and information management skills. The three activities highest in demand were developing goals and operating programs, relating to people of other races and cultures, and interviewing and one-to-one work. The major emphasis was on planning and inter-personal relations rather than on research or instruction.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

A study of the EPDA training programs was completed in February, 1973 (Abt Associates, Inc. A Study of the Education Professions Development Act Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Office of Education, Office of Planning and Evaluation, 1973).

Program Name:

College Personnel Development, Fellowships for the Disadvantaged (CLEO)

Legislation: HEA, 1965, Title IX, Part D, as amended

Expiration Date: June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1973	$1,000,000	$ 0
1974	$1,000,000	750,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of Title IX, D is to provide fellowships to persons of ability from disadvantaged backgrounds, as determined by the Commissioner of Education, to undertake graduate or professional study. The Council on Legal Education Opportunity was established for the purpose of bringing about a significant increase in the number of lawyers from minority and disadvantaged group. The CLEO Program, formerly operated by OEO, has been transferred to DHEW and the decision has been made to fund CLEO from the Title IX, Part D (section 961) authority. The FY 1974 appropriation is the first for the Program under OE direction.

The law authorizing this program places a $1,000,000 ceiling on expenditures for these fellowships. From this maximum authorization must be paid a minimum stipend to each student of $2,800 per year, a dependency allowance of $300 for each dependent up to 5 dependents, an institutional allowance of 150 percent of the stipend paid to each fellow, and a travel allowance for each fellow and his dependents. It is estimated, therefore, that each such fellowship will cost $7,950 on the average.

Program Scope

In fiscal year 1974, OE will fund 94 continuation fellowships but no new fellowships. In fiscal year 1973, OEO funded 214 new fellowships but, because of limited funds, these fellowships were funded for only one year rather than for three years as had been the previous practice.

Program Effectiveness

The program is still too new to assess its impact in relation to the intended objectives.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations

No studies planned.

Source of Evaluation Data

None available

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

College Personnel Development, Allen J. Ellender Fellowships

Legislation	Expiration Date:
Education Amendments of 1972. Part C. Section 961 (a) (2). Public Law 92-506.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1973	$ 500,000	$500,000
	1974	500,000	500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

P. L. 92-506 authorizes the Commissioner of Education to make grants to the Close Up Foundation of Washington, D. C. to assist in carrying out a program of increasing the understanding of the Federal Government among secondary school students, their teachers, and the communities they represent. Up to 1,500 fellowships are awarded each year to economically disadvantaged secondary school students and to secondary school teachers.

Program Scope:

A total of 1,232 fellowships were awarded during fiscal year 1973, 419 to teachers and 813 to students representing 8 communities. The total amount awarded through May 20 has been $409,046, resulting in an average cost of $332 per fellowship. Plans are under way to award an additional 265 fellowships at an estimated cost of $84,000 from the balance of the 1973 appropriation.

Program Effectiveness:

This program is too new for measures of effectiveness to be available.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

None planned.

Source of Evaluation Data:

None available.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Veterans Cost-of-Instruction Program

Legislation:

Section 420 of Title X of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 72-318)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975 (Expenditures to be continued until June 30, 1976)

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1973	None	$ 25,000,000
	1974	None	23,750,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to enable institutions of higher education to apply for payments to be used for the support of new or improved services to veterans.

The institution must spend at least 50% of its Cost-of-Instruction award for setting up an Office of Veterans Affairs (OVA) with at least one full-time veterans coordinator to operate the veterans office and the legally mandated services for veterans.

The remainder of the award not needed to provide required services may be used to defray instructional expenses (salaries, office expenses, equipment and research) in academically-related programs.

Institutions of higher education who have 10% more veterans enrolled during the first academic year of application than during the preceding academic year are eligible. Thereafter they must maintain the veteran enrollment of the first year of eligibility.

Veterans must also be participating in at least one of the following five programs to be included in the veteran count of institutions under the Cost-of-Instruction program:

1. Vocational Rehabilitation Subsistence in Higher Education (Ch. 31 of Title 38);

2. Educational Assistance Program (Ch. 34 of Title 38);

3. Elementary and Secondary Educational Assistance - a remedial program to qualify the veteran for admission to a post-secondary institution (Section 1691, Subchapter V of Chapter 34 of Title 38);

4. Special Supplementary Education - an individualized tutorial assistance program (Section 1692, Subchapter V of Chapter 34 of Title 38).

5. Predischarge Education Program or PREP (Subchapter VI of Title 38).

Program Scope:

Of the total number of 1,169 requests received from institutions in FY 1973, 1,057 were approved.

During its first year of funding (FY 1973), the appropriation of $25 million or 18% of requested funds resulted in payments to institutions of $53 per veteran instead of $300 possible under full funding.

Program Effectiveness:

The program is in its first year of operation, too soon for the program effectiveness to be adequately measured.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

As part of a projected study of the impact of federal student assistance programs on students and institutions, program application and fiscal operating reports will be analyzed to determine how well this program is meeting its legislative goals.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

None

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities

Legislation:

Title III, P.L. 88-204, P.L. 84-329
Title VII-C as amended by Education Amendments
of 1972.

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1964	$120,000,000	$ 0
1965	120,000,000	169,250,000
1966	120,000,000	110,000,000
1967	200,000,000	200,000,000
1968	400,000,000	0
1969	400,000,000	100,000,000
1970	400,000,000	0
1971	400,000,000	0
1972	50,000,000	0
1973	100,000,000	0
1974	150,000,000	0

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to make loans to institutions of higher education and higher education building agencies to assist in the construction or improvement of undergraduate and graduate academic facilities.

The amount of a loan plus any other Federal funds may not exceed 80% of the eligible cost of a project. Loans are made on the basis of approved applications with not more than 12.5% of the appropriation awarded to projects in any one state. Interest on these loans is not to exceed three percent.

Program Scope:

In the last few years this program has not received any appropriations--having been supplanted by the Annual Interest Grant Program. However, the program has been authorized to make new loans to the extent that funds are made available through the withdrawal, by institutions of higher education, of prior year approved loan commitments. In FY 1972, 19 such loans totalling $11,074,000 were made to 18 institutions. The loans were targeted to Black, private colleges.

In FY 1973, however, there were no funds for additional loans.

Program Effectiveness:

Since the inception of the program, loans have been made to some 400 institutions to assist in the construction of over 600 new facilities.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation:

An evaluation of facilities needs and program impact is being made by Froomkin, Inc. under contract to OPBE. Preliminary data indicate this program was effective in assisting institutions to build needed academic facilities.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Higher Education
Froomkin Joseph, The Demand for Facilities in the Post-Secondary Sector, 1975 to 1990.

E. Education Professions Development Programs

1. Teacher Corps Program
2. Educational Leadership Program
3. Career Opportunities Program
4. Early Childhood Program
5. Exceptional Children Program
6. Training of Teacher Trainers Program
7. Pupil Personnel Services Program
8. Urban/Rural School Development Program
9. Teacher Training in Developing Institutions Program
10. Vocational Education Personnel Program

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Teacher Corps Program

Legislation: | **Expiration Date:**

Title V, P. L. 89-329(1965) amended by Part B-1, | FY 1976

P. L. 90-35 - Education Professions Development Act

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	$ 36,100,000	$ 9,500,000
	1967	64,715,000	11,324,000
	1968	33,000,000	13,500,000
	1969	46,000,000	20,900,000
	1970	80,000,000	21,737,000
	1971	100,000,000	30,800,000
	1972	100,000,000	37,435,000
	1973	37,500,000	37,500,000
	1974	37,500,000	37,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purposes of the Teacher Corps are (1) to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having high concentrations of low-income families, and (2) to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation. To achieve this, the Teacher Corps attracts and trains college graduates and upperclassmen to serve in teams under experienced teachers; attracts volunteers to serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants; and attracts and trains educational personnel to provide specialized training for juvenile delinquents, youth offenders, and adult criminal offenders. Typical participant activities involve academic work in a college or university, on the job training in schools, and participation in school related community projects. Typical program elements include flexible models of teacher education based on performance criteria, involvement with other college and university departments outside the school of education, granting credit for the internship period, and utilization of regular school staff and members of the community in the teaching staff.

Program Scope:

During fiscal year 1973 the Teacher Corps had in operation 395 projects and of this number 240 were continuing and 155 were new starts. The total participant level remained relatively the same as was for the previous fiscal year (4500) and projects, through differentiated staffing and individualized instructional activities, directly affected the learning experiences of 125,000 children of whom 47,700 (37.8) were from families with incomes below $3,000. Approximately 80 percent of these children were from elementary schools. Teacher Corps programs impacted on 180 school districts, and such special clientele groups as bilingual children, (14 projects) Indian children (8 projects) and children in training institutions (4 projects). Teacher Corps also ran a special program which encourages high school and college students, parents and other community residents to serve as tutors or instructional assistants for children in disadvantaged areas.

Program Effectiveness

A number of evaluation studies provide information and insight about program operation. For example, a survey of June, 1972 Teacher Corps graduates was conducted by Teacher Corps in August, 1972. Seventy percent, or 900 of 1300 graduates responded. About 570 or 63 percent indicated that they would remain in the field of education with 27% (240) of them teaching in the school district where they served as interns. Ten percent (90) of the interns had not found teaching positions at the time of the survey.

In addition, the Comptroller General's Office issued a report to the Congress in July, 1972, concerning the assessment of the Teacher Corps program made by the General Accounting Office (GAO). The study consisted of a review of Teacher Corps projects at seven institutions of higher education and the respective participating local education agencies. Also, a questionnaire was sent to all Corps members in the Nation who had completed their internships in 1968 and 1969. A total of 550 responded to the questionnaire. The findings and conclusions are grouped according to the two major program purposes as follows:

1. Strengthening educational opportunities

The GAO found that the program strengthened the educational opportunities for children of low-income families who attended schools where Corps members were assigned. Corps members provided more individualized instruction, used new teaching methods, and expanded classroom and extracurricular activities. Most of the interns and team leaders believed that children in the schools served by the program had benefited from it. The classroom assistance provided by interns made it possible for regular teachers to devote more time to individualized instruction and make classes more relevant to the needs of the children.

Some of the Teacher Corps approaches to educating children were continued by the school districts after corps members completed their assignments. Other approaches were discontinued because the school districts either had not determined their usefulness or did not have sufficient staff and financial resources to carry them on. Corps members generally became involved with various types of educational community activities which most Corps members believe had been of benefit to both children and adults. Some believed, however, that the activities were of little or no benefit due to poor planning and lack of community support. A majority of the interns who graduated from the program remained in the field of education. Most of these interns took teaching positions in schools serving low-income areas.

2. Broadening teacher-training program

The GAO study indicates that the program had some success in broadening teacher preparation programs at institutions of higher education. All seven institutions made some changes in their regular teacher preparation program as a result of the Teacher Corps. Five institutions developed a special curriculum for the Teacher Corps; the other two used existing courses. Most interns believed that their academic coursework was relevant to their needs. The impact of the program was lessened, however, because much of the special curriculum was not made available to non-Teacher Corps students and because institutions had not identified teaching approaches and techniques that would warrant inclusion in their regular teacher preparation programs. The institutions that used existing courses for Teacher Corps students did not determine the effectiveness of these courses in preparing Corps members to teach disadvantaged children.

Another relevant study is the Resource Management Corporation evaluation of Teacher Corps during FY 72. This evaluation covered 70 projects having 2,490 interns. Sixty-three projects with approximately 1900 interns responded to the survey instruments. The major conclusion drawn from this study was that while the Teacher Corps projects (63 studied) had met their goals in terms of operating within program guidelines, there were some areas that stood out as meriting attention by program specialists. The academic training offered to interns, for example, was more flexible than desired by the program staff. 31 percent of the total course-work was open for negotiation by interns, with 69 percent required by the co college or project. This finding approached the 50-50 balance established as a program goal. In addition, interns perceived a lack of communication between groups within a project and cited this as the major problem area for the program.

A further area of concern was in the level of involvement of many advisory councils and of the community in general in project operations. One example was that in 26 projects advisory councils met quarterly or semi-annually. Finally, considerably more projects emphasized change in college training programs as opposed to change in the school systems.

At least one analysis of a particular project — the Louisville, Kentucky Cycle V Project — offers further useful insight into program operations and accomplishments. The major thrust of this project was to strengthen educational opportunities in inner-city schools by training 100 Teacher Corps interns to become working partners on facilitating teams. These interns were an integral part of a ten-member teaching team employing humanistic learning processes, relevant curriculum and flexible educational structures. The teaching staffs of six elementary schools were reassigned as necessary so that these schools could be completely restructured around 3 to 6 teaching teams each composed of one experienced coordinating teacher (team leader), another experienced teacher (staff teacher) four Teacher Corps interns, two paraprofessionals, and student teachers when available. Each team instructed approximately 100 children in an open learning environment.

During the first year of the Cycle V Teacher Corps project, only 17% of the elementary classes (grades 2-6) in project schools had an increase of 0.7 year or more in the total reading achievement mean. But, in the second year of the project this percentaged had more than tripled to 54% of the classes (grades) having an increase of 0.7 year or more. The percentage indicating a year or more of growth advanced from only 4% to 18%.

Other advantages resulting either totally or partially from Cycle V Teacher Corps include:

1. A lowered pupil-teacher ratio by using differentiated staffing.

2. More creativity and innovation in the schools due to the wide range of backgrounds of Corpsmen.

3. Decreased vandalism and increased school attendance.

4. Communication improved at all levels of instruction.

5. Increased individualization of instruction.

6. Improved pupil attitude toward school and self-concepts according to pre- and post-test data.

2-2

7. Increased special programs for children with special needs, e.g., behavior modification classes, enrichment programs, tutorial and remedial classes.

8. Involvement of parents in making curriculum decisions.

9. Training of teachers to use behavioral objectives.

10. Increased counseling services for pupils.

11. A behavior modification program (Swinging Door) initiated by Cycle V interns to remain in the School System and be expanded.

12. Development of a 10-year plan for spreading team teaching and differentiated staffing in the District.

13. Neighborhood School Boards as an integral part of local school decision-making.

14. Closer communication and cooperation between universities and the School District.

15. Cross-age tutoring established and to be expanded throughout the District.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A major new study of the impact and effectiveness of Teacher Corps was begun in July, 1972. A contract was negotiated between OE and Contemporary Research Incorporated, Los Angeles with System Development Corporation, Los Angeles as sub-contractor. This will be the first comprehensive study to concentrate attention and evaluation on measurement of program performance in terms of the ultimate student performance goal. The study will focus on assessing and analyzing the impact of the program as measured by three major dimensions -- institutional change, enhanced teaching skills and behaviors, and improved classroom learning by students taught by Teacher Corps interns and graduates. Twenty 6th cycle elementary school projects will participate in the study. An interim report of this study was submitted to OE January 1974.

In addition, an NEA/Ford Foundation study of Teacher Corps was released in mid-1973. The study was conducted from the viewpoint of assessing the program as an instrument of large-scale organizational change involving the strategies in 4th and 5th cycles. Several critiques are now being prepared by the National Education Association.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual operational data collected by the Teacher Corps Program.
2. United States Office of Education telephone survey of Teacher Corps graduates who completed programs in June 1972.
3. *Assessment of the Teacher Corps Program* -- Report to the Congress by The Comptroller General of the United States, July 14, 1972.
4. *Full-Scale Implementation of a Process Evaluation System for Programs of the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems* (formerly BEPD) by Resource Management Corporation, December 1, 1972.
5. *Louisville, Kentucky Cycle V. Teacher Corps Project -- A Process Evaluation*, June, 1971.
6. *A Study of Teacher Training At Sixth Cycle Teacher Corps Projects* by Contemporary Research Incorporated, January, 1974.
7. *Reform and Organizational Survival: The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change* by Ronald G. Corwin. John Wiley & Sons, 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Leadership Program

Legislation: **Expiration Date:**

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

FY 1973

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$90,000,000 (All of Part D)	$2,739,000
	1971	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	3,892,000
	1972	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	5,284,000
	1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D.)	4,544,027
	1974	(Total EPDA - $300,000,000)	terminated

Program Purpose and Operations:

The Educational Leadership Program supports projects to increase the competence of people who now serve or intend to serve as administrators in elementary or secondary school systems at the local or State level. The primary objectives of the program are:

1. To identify and recruit personnel, especially from new and varied manpower sources, and train them for school administrative positions in inner-city schools and other difficult and challenging settings;

2. To create new or improve existing training programs for administrators which:

    a. reflect cooperative arrangements between local education agencies, institutions of higher education, and other agencies;

    b. are directed toward new roles for administrators; and

c. influence change in the regular educational administration program within the university.

3. To train trainers of administrators and other leadership personnel. Grants are made to local education agencies, institutions of higher education, and State education agencies.

Individuals who are now administrators or who wish to become administrators in elementary and secondary schools are eligible to participate. An attempt is made to attract promising young people from both educational and noneducational backgrounds. Emphasis is given to recruiting minority participants.

Highest priority is given to projects which seek to improve the quality of education in inner-city schools. The group to be served in this setting is largely comprised of minority groups and other disadvantaged.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 73, the Educational Leadership Program funded 19 projects providing pre-service training to 196 persons and in-service training to an additional 600 persons for a total of 796. Over 30% of the pre-service participants represented minority groups and most participants were training for positions in inner-city schools.

In FY 72, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of the 28 projects. It was observed that the major goal of this program is to recruit potential administrators from new and varied manpower sources and to place them in inner-city and other schools having socio-economic characteristics similar to inner-city schools. In both of these aspects, the evaluation revealed that the projects are not meeting program goals. While 60 percent of the participants are members of minority groups, only 12 percent have been recruited from occupational groups outside the field of education. It was also found that 31 percent of the projects have no staff member responsible for assisting participants in job placement.

The FY 73 Resource Management Corporation process evaluation has not been completed.

Ongoing and Plannned Evaluation Studies:

No major impact evaluation study is planned or underway. This program is to be terminated in FY 1973.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Operational data collected by the Educational Leadership Program. These data are collected annually.
2. Process Evaluation of the programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Career Opportunities Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$90,000,000 (All of Part D)	$22,117,000
	1971	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	25,987,000
	1972	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	26,163,000
	1973	(Total EPDA -- $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D)	24,955,000
	1974	(Total EPDA -- $300,000,000)	22,394,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The purpose of the Career Opportunities Program (COP) is to improve the education of children from low-income families by:

1. Attracting low-income persons -- including Vietnam veterans -- to new careers in schools serving people from low-income families;
2. Finding better ways of utilizing school staffs for services;
3. Developing training programs for school aide personnel leading to full certification as teachers which combine college level work study and structured career advancement opportunities;
4. Encouraging greater understanding and participation between the community and the education system; and
5. Increasing cooperative relationships between related programs, agencies, and institutions.

Awards are made to local education agencies, which design training programs jointly with community organizations and agencies, community colleges, and nearby universities, and with their State education agencies. The schools subcontract with cooperating institutions of higher education to provide training services. Projects must be located in schools with high concentrations of low-income families.

The Career Opportunities Program encourages low-income men and women to start their careers as education auxiliaries at whatever level their abilities and interests permit, then follow a career lattice to more responsible, more remunerative, and more challenging jobs in low-income area schools.

Career Opportunities help school districts and universities create programs that are more relevant to the needs of low-income people and to the career training needs of the participants themselves. Training combines academic study towards high school equivalency, the associate of arts and the baccalaureate degrees, with classroom work in low-income area schools supervised by experienced teachers, who serve as team leaders and cooperating teachers. A combination of courses and practicum enable participants to earn 30 credits per calendar year.

Program Scope:

The fiscal year 1973 funds will be expended in academic year 1973-74 to continue all 130 COP projects. Fiscal year 1973 will be the first year of administration of the COP program by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regional offices. Staff training for both regional and central staff is currently underway.

Every COP project has both informal and formal linkages with other government agencies and programs such as Housing and Urban Development, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Right-to-Read Program.

There are currently 8,400 COP participants. Preliminary information on some of these participants indicates the following:

-- There are 1,601 participants who are Vietnam era veterans.

-- There are 611 participants specializing in special education.

-- There are 378 Indian participants.

-- There are 160 COP aides working as supervisors of Youth-Tutoring Youth.

In addition, to date 678 COP participants have graduated. Of these, 464 (68%) have been employed by the local education agency in which they were aides. Another 162 (24%) of the graduates are employed by other school systems or are in graduate school.

Program Effectiveness:

A national impact evaluation of COP was conducted by Abt and Associates, Inc. in FY '72. The findings show that the Program is successful when measured by the following impacts:

(1) COP aides are representative of the targeted program population. They show strong motivation to continue in the Program and become teachers, and have a positive professional view of themselves. As such, the Program has provided a vehicle for upward mobility for the aides.

(2) Satisfaction with the Program is high among superintendents, principals, teachers, and COP aides.

(3) Principals want more COP aides in their classrooms and feel that they increase the amount of individual instruction scheduled for children. They perceive COP aides as more professional than other teacher aides.

(4) Superintendents see the COP aides as linkages between their schools and community groups. They want more aides for both regular classes and for special students. There is some evidence supporting less restrictive requirements in the hiring of teachers when COP is in the school system.

(5) Institutions of higher education report changes in course content, schedules, and entrance requirements not only to accommodate COP but also as a result of their COP experiences. These changes, present, planned, or being considered for all students were in the direction of performance-based teacher education.

(6) State Education Agencies show a positive relationship between the presence of COP in their schools and changes in credentialing requirements.

There is not yet any evidence showing positive impact on student academic performance and attitudes.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no evaluation projects currently underway or planned.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Program operational and fiscal data collected by COP.
2. Impact Evaluation of the Career Opportunities Program by Abt and Associates, Inc., January 1, 1973.
3. COP Project, Richmond, California Unified School District.
4. Project COP, Division of Research, Memphis City Schools Memphis, Tennessee.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Early Childhood Program

Legislation: **Expiration Date:**

P. L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

FY 1973

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$90,000,000 (All of Part D)	$4,778,000
	1971	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	5,669,000
	1972	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	4,308,000
	1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D)	829,965
	1974	(Total EPDA - $300,000,000)	terminated

Program Purpose and Operations:

The Early Childhood Program supports projects to train and retrain personnel for programs for young children ages 3-9. The primary objectives of the program are to increase the supply of qualified teacher trainers, supervisors, curriculum and evaluation specialists, teachers and aides in early childhood education and to improve the quality of training programs for these personnel. Grants are provided to institutions of higher education, local education agencies and State Education agencies for institutes or fellowships or combined programs.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In fiscal year 1973, the Early Childhood Program funded 5 projects serving 72 educational personnel all of whom were teacher trainers or teachers with inservice training responsibilities.

17

In FY 1972-73, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a second process evaluation of 35 projects. The key observations made in this study are:

(1) this program has an extensive, well-developed set of program conditions to guide projects in the field.

(2) project performance is good, in general, although it appears low in many cases because of the high goals set.

(3) project self-evaluation is strong and most projects have begun to incorporate successful project features into regular programs of colleges and/or school districts.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No projected studies are currently planned for this area.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Operational data collected by the Early Childhood Program. Data are collected annually.
2. The Plus in Education -- An Evaluation of Project TECT and KET.
3. Summative Evaluation -- A Program to provide for coordination of training of workers in early childhood education.
4. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by the Resource Management Corporation and again in May 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Exceptional Children (formerly Special Education)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P. L. 90-35, 1967, Parts C, D, and F Education Professions Development Act	FY 1976

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	$90,000,000 (All of Part D)	$ 6,992,000
1971	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	6,655,000
1972	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	5,483,000
1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D).	4,214,897
1974	(Total EPDA - $300,000,000)	3,907,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program trains educational leaders, regular classroom teachers and other educational personnel to deal effectively with exceptional children who are in regular, rather than special, classrooms. The need for this training is based on two factors: (1) there is a shortage of specially-trained teachers; and (2) there is a growing trend toward moving children who are physically handicapped or have other learning difficulties into the mainstream of regular classrooms where teachers are generally not equipped to meet their needs. This program, therefore, concentrates on:

a) training inservice regular classroom personnel to identify children with potential or current handicapping conditions and to diagnose, prescribe, and implement an educational program for such children, and training educational leaders to facilitate such training programs.

b) developing training and protocol materials necessary to implement such a training program.

c) providing developmental assistance to local and State educational agencies and institutions of higher education to help them develop training for educational personnel to work with exceptional children.

Grants are made to institutions of higher education and State and local education agencies.

Program Scope:

Approximately 1,322 persons in 29 projects are participating in innovative training programs for the preparation of leadership personnel in teaching exceptional children with an emphasis in the early childhood area. Approximately 50 percent of the participants are non-whites representing Blacks, Chicanos and American-Indians.

The Houston Independent School project is the first one in the State of Texas to implement the five-year plan to transfer all handicapped children to regular classrooms. This project could provide a model for the rest of the nation. The Pennsylvania University Project has a teacher training van which is touring the smaller towns of Pennsylvania. It is bringing a special curriculum to the teachers in this area. This may open a new means of training teachers who are in rural areas.

Recent court decisions (e.g., District of Columbia, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, California) have mandated the integration of exceptional children into regular classrooms. This trend is growing and there is a proliferation of similar cases pending. The need, therefore, for existing regular classroom teachers to receive training which will enable them to meet the needs of these children with special problems, is greater than ever. During academic year 1973-74, 16 projects will be operational with 1973 funds. One of these will produce training materials. In addition, three field-based developmental assistance centers will be funded which focus upon educational leaders and trainers of teachers and experienced educational personnel. Every effort will be made, with limited funds, to provide assistance to those States and school districts undergoing change as a result of court decisions or legislative mandate.

To date, there have been approximately 15,000 minority people in leadership positions who have been participants in these programs. As a result of this the number of minority people moving into leadership positions has greatly increased. All projects have been in low-income areas where the incidence of handicapping conditions has been greatest. This has permitted working directly with the people most affected.

Program Effectiveness:

In 1972, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of 39 projects. The overall conclusion of this study is that the major goal of the Special Education Program -- the training of teachers to teach handicapped children in regular classroom settings -- is being met by most of the projects studied. Academic and practicum training are directed to this end, emphasizing identification, diagnosis, and remediation for handicapped children. No major problem areas were cited by participants and there were no frequently mentioned suggestions for project improvement. Self-evaluation of projects is well underway, with most projects having established measurable objectives for the evaluation.

On-going and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No projected studies are currently planned for this area. There are no major studies underway; nevertheless, each project is required to have an internal evaluation component.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual site visits
2. Annual review by the University of Minnesota Leadership Training Institute
3. Quarterly and yearly reports.
4. Review of 1971-72 projects by the University of Minnesota Leadership Training Institute.
5. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Education Personnel Development, December 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Training of Teacher Trainers Program

Legislation: Expiration Date:

P.L. 90-35, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

FY 1974

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$102,750,000	$62,647,000
1967	226,250,000	70,250,000
1968	354,750,000	75,250,000
1969	300,000,000	80,000,000
1970	340,000,000	13,280,000
1971	340,000,000	12,200,000
1972		10,000,000
1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D.)	10,000,000
1974	(Total EPDA - $300,000,000	

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Trainers of Teacher Trainers Program (TTT) supports combined short and long-term training projects for trainers of teacher trainers and for teacher trainers in institutions of higher education and in local and State education agencies. The primary objectives of the program are to reform teacher training, to improve the capability of institutions of higher education to train the trainers of teachers, to upgrade the status of teacher training in universities, and to broaden the base of teacher training to include the liberal arts and the schools and their communities. The strategies utilized by the program to achieve these objectives include the identification and involvement of the "gatekeepers," e.g., the graduate level teachers of those who train teachers, graduate professors of education, and liberal arts professors who commonly deny their teacher training role; the use of Federal funds to modify faculty reward systems; the establishment of parity relationships among the "producers" and "consumers" of teachers by shared decision-making with the schools and communities; an emphasis on the use of schools as site and scene of most teacher training; and the institutionalization of the reforms as they develop.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

The program consists of 29 projects involving directly or indirectly some 10,000 persons. Representation includes school administrators, faculty and students in institutions of higher education, experienced and inexperienced teachers, personnel from State and local education agencies. Paraprofessionals and members of the community also participated in TTT activities. While the program has done much toward bringing a number of groups together to enhance the re-training of college teachers, many involved with the projects continue to see the lack of communication between groups as the major problem facing the program. In order to focus more effectively on this problem, and to strengthen the multiplier effect sought by the program, two related groups have been formed. One, the TTT oral history project, has staff directly responsible for the compilation of oral histories of projects at fifteen of the twenty-nine projects. The other effort, called Project Open, was begun by the six cluster centers to further develop TTT strategies aimed at inter-institutional change at the national level.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

During FY '74 correlation of collected data and further research into other program documentation will be conducted by the Evaluation Research Center, University of Virginia; a final report in seven volumes will be completed and made available for study, as well as a popularized version in shorter form for more general consumption.

Source:

Trainer of Teacher Trainers, Final Evaluation Report, Volume I, Summary Evaluation Research Center, University of Virginia, December 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Pupil Personnel Services Program

Legislation: | **Expiration Date:**

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

FY 1973

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$90,000,000 (All of Part D)	$3,859,000
	1971	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	4,586,000
	1972	90,000,000	3,722,000
	1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D.)	1,281,498
	1974	(Total EPDA - $300,000,000)	terminated

Program Purpose and Operations:

The goal of the program is to improve the quality of education for low-achieving students from families of low-income by providing entry and practicing pupil personnel service workers with interdisciplinary training coupled with practicum experience.

The specific objectives are:

1. To improve qualifications of trainers and supervisors of pupil personnel specialists;
2. To develop alternative manpower development models;
3. To recruit and train minority group members as pupil personnel specialists; and
4. To bring about organizational change in both the training institutions and in schools where pupil personnel specialists function.

Projects include training in the following fields:

1. Guidance services, including counseling;
2. Psychological services, including school psychology, psychiatric, and other mental health services;
3. Social services, including school social work, attendance work, and visiting teacher services; and
4. Health services, including the teacher (or school) nurse, physician, and dental hygienist.

Projects may be short (usually no less than 6 weeks total) or long (as much as two summers and the intervening academic year). Although summer training projects are usually full time, any project may call for either full- or part-time participation or a combination of these.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 73 grants were made to 8 institutions of higher education to provide training for trainers of pupil personnel workers as well as prospective and experienced pupil personnel specialists at the pre-school and elementary levels. A total of 1000 such personnel participated in these programs.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No projected impact studies are currently planned for this area. Information is being gathered by historian-observers on each center/satellite project's material and inter-institutional relationships and the specific instances of change due to this program. Data from this effort should be available in FY 1974.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data.
2. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Urban/Rural School Development Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 90-35, 1967 Part D, Section 531 Education Professions Development Act	FY 1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	(Obligated) Appropriation
	1971	$ 90,000,000 (All of Part D)	$10,527,000
	1972	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	11,989,000
	1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D)	10,297,640
	1974	(Total EPDA - $300,000,000)	11,529,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The Urban/Rural School Development Program is designed to bring about enriched learning opportunities for students in schools serving a high concentration of low-income families. Its basic purpose is to produce -- (over the life of a five-year project) -- accelerated classroom academic achievement, improved affective development, and increased range of opportunities for students. Through a strategy of close school-community collaboration, the program concentrates on the following intermediate objectives:

1. To make training for educational personnel more responsive to the needs of the school, its staff, its pupil population, and the community by means of concentrating training and program development resources in a single school or in a limited number of related schools;

2. To develop improved decision-making capabilities in school and community personnel;

3. To develop within the school and community a continuous process for identifying critical needs and assembling ideas, resources, and strategies to meet those needs; and

4. To effect a process through which the individual school and its community accepts responsibility for its decision, and is accountable for its action regarding the utilization of resources, formulation of strategies and development of a program to improve pupil performance.

Local education agencies are the usual grantees.

Educational personnel normally employed in participating schools (teachers, paraprofessionals, counselors, principals, etc.) receive training, and implement curricular and organizational reforms.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

There are 41 current projects including about 6,500 school staff and community members. Funds appropriated in fiscal year 1972, and expended during academic year 1972-73 provided for extensive developmental assistance to each of these 41 sites for the difficult and sensitive process of establishing viable school-community councils and initiating local needs assessment activities.

Expenditure of fiscal year 1973 funds vary according to the stage of development of the various models. All school-community councils are in operation and plans are developed for more intensive training for staff and council members during the coming year. Process evaluation and on site developmental assistance will be intensified to aid management and staff members as they move into more fully developed comprehensive staff development systems. Academic year 1973-74 will be the second operational year in a projected five-year operational program of support to the 41 sites.

On-going and Planned Evaluation Studies:

All projects are currently engaged in evaluation activity and by June 1974 it is anticipated that a reliable impact evaluation of the program's effect upon children's learning and behavior will be available.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data.
2. National and Regional Conferences.
3. Reports from LTI Regional Coordinators.
4. Program officer site visits.
5. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by the Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Teacher Training in Developing Institutions Program

Legislation: **Expiration Date:**

P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	$ 90,000,000 (All of Part D)	$ 9,466,000 - 3.0 EPDA
1971	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	4,900,000 - 4.9 EPDA
1972	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	4,900,000 - 4.9 EPDA
1973		3.0 HEA III 3.3 ESA 1.7
1974		Decision pending

Program Purpose:

The broad purpose of the Teacher Training in Developing Institutions (TTDI) Program are:

(1) improve the professional competence of participants in language arts, reading, mathematics consumer economics, and Afro-American studies;

(2) prepare the participants to work more effectively in newly desegregating school settings.

(3) enhance progressively the teacher training capacity of the grantee institutions in the subject area of the project; and

(4) provide advanced specialty and pre-doctoral training for educational personnel who have been or may be displaced or adversely affected by the school desegregation process.

Program Scope:

Indications are that although the Teacher Training in Developing Institutions program (TTDI) is being phased out as an EPDA account, there is a possibility that some programs will be re-funded. The Bureau of Higher Education will make the determination around March 31 — April 1, 1974.

During the 1972-73 period 35 institutes were held during the summer, 1971, which enrolled 1,250 participants or a mean of 37 per institute. There were 24 percent males and 76 percent females and 73 percent Blacks and 27 percent Whites. Among the participants, 58 percent taught in elementary school, 34 percent in secondary school, and 8 percent in pre-kindergarten, college, or adult teaching. The participants taught a total of 79,358 pupils. The summer institute staff was 244 or 7.3 per institution, the majority (75 percent) of whom were professionals. Racially, the staff included 57 percent Blacks and 43 percent Whites with men and women equally represented. Seventy-three percent of the staff members held professional rank and 53.7 percent held the doctoral degree. Approximately 71.2 percent of the staff had experience teaching in the public schools, while 95.6 percent had prior experience in higher education.

During the academic year, there were 38 institutes enrolling 1,269 participants or a mean of 33 percent institution. The sex, ethnic distribution, and educational level of the academic year participants were comparable to the summer institute group. The academic year enrollees taught a total of 76,780 pupils, the majority of whom were enrolled in junior and senior high schools. The project staffs were comparable to the summer staffs during this period, but generally were part-time with the institute during the academic year component.

Program Effectiveness:

An evaluation carried out by the Human Affairs Research Center looked at 38 TTDI projects during 1971-72. An overall assessment and a detailed analysis of all projects were undertaken through site visits and observations along with participant questionnaire data.

Employing a set of systematic criteria 16 percent of the projects were judged significantly effective, 42 percent were judged very effective, 42 percent were judged effective.

A total of 580 of the 1280 summer participants responded to the questionnaire representing a 46 percent return. The vast majority of these improved skills in the preparation of teaching materials, improved ability to communicate with persons of racial groups other than their own and improved ability to develop and implement effective teaching strategies.

The main thrust of the Teacher Training in Developing Institutes program is to strengthen developing institutions, predominantly Black, in such a way as to enable them to more effectively deliver quality teacher training programs as well as to implement strategies for educational reform.

In FY 72, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of 38 projects in the programs. The findings reveal that the participants are satisfied with the TTDI program. Eighty-six percent of the participants in the 39 projects studied indicated that the project was meeting their expectations and there was no discernible trend concerning the weakest or poorest project feature. This satisfaction may be short-lived, however, since only 30 percent of the projects have a staff member responsible for providing placement assistance to participants.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No projected studies are currently planned for this area. There are no major studies underway.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data
2. An evaluation of the 1971-72 Teacher Training in Developing Institutions Program. The Human Affairs Research Center, New York.
3. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education Personnel Development Program

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
P.L. 90-35, 1967, Education Professions Development Act, Part F, Sec. 552 & 553 Amended 12/68	FY 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization		Appropriation
1970	$35,000,000	(Part F)	$ 5,698,000
1971	40,000,000	"	6,900,000
1972	45,000,000		6,900,000
1973	50,000,000	(Est.	11,800,000
1974	50,000,000	Amt.)	11,268,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The goal of the Vocational Education Personnel Program is to provide State and local career education leaders with the capability for developing a systems approach to professional personnel development which is responsive to local needs and which will effect improved preparation of education personnel at institutions of higher education. The enabling objectives are 1) to initiate cooperative arrangements between State and local education to ensure the adequate preparation and developing of professional personnel for career and vocational education; 2) to improve the quality and effectiveness of the instruction and administration of existing career and vocational programs; and 3) to continue support for the revision and refinement of the States systems for professional personnel development in career and vocational education.

The Vocational Education State Systems Program provides opportunities for State boards for vocational education and institutions of higher education to train and retrain experienced vocational education personnel and other personnel in order to strengthen vocational education programs and the administration of schools offering these programs. This is accomplished through grants that are awarded to States according to the degree to which they have developed a statewide plan for professional personnel development in vocational education.

The Vocational Education Leadership Development Program, which grants awards to institutions of higher education for the development of new and innovative programs at the leadership level, has been the second component of the Vocational Personnel Development Program. The doctoral component of this program with 216 participants was phased out in FY 1973. In addition, 256 participants benefitted from a one-year leadership program.

In addition, the purpose of this program under Part D of the Education Professions Development Act is to provide project grants and developmental assistance to State education agencies, local education agencies and institutions of higher education to orient or reorient nonvocational personnel to include career development aspects in all of their instructional programs. The target population of both Part F and Part D includes career development aspects in all of their instructional programs. The target population of both Part F and Part D includes all levels of educational personnel including para-professionals.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

1. Fifty-four States including Puerto Rico, Samoa and the Trust territories have now designed and implemented a plan for the development of vocational education personnel.

2. Each State agency has established at the State-level a specific unit with responsibility for determining professional personnel needs on a Statewide basis; for planning, coordinating; and funding programs to meet those needs; and for monitoring and maintaining a continuous assessment and evaluation of the State system for Vocational education personnel development.

3. Approximately 200 training programs involving participants from all service areas have been supported with a resulting reduction of fragmentation in the field and a more comprehensive approach to teacher education and local program operation.

4. At least 48 States and six territories are now making special efforts to bring State and local education agencies and institutions of higher education together for a more coordinated and concerted effort in developing and expanding vocational education to meet the needs of each State.

5. There have been approximately 40 projects conducted for in-service training in management by objectives for all of their State-staff plus some local administrative personnel.

6. Approximately 25 States are re-evaluating their certification requirements for vocational education personnel and are beginning to relate them to competency-based criteria.

7. Special projects in approximately 12 States have trained educational personnel for implementing the career education concept at the local level.

8. Eighteen universities received assistance in implementing comprehensive leadership development programs at the doctoral level to supply high-level leadership personnel for career and vocational education. There were 216 Federally supported,

and 48 State supported participants enrolled in doctoral programs of these universities. Federal funding level for this program was 1.9 million. Commencing in September 1973, one-year leadership development programs were initiated in [illegible] institutions. There were 286 participants enrolled at a funding level of $3.0 million.

9. Activities supported through the States during FY 71 and the approximate percentages of total funding for each category include: (1) in-service programs for increasing the competencies to teachers, administrators, and support personnel (45%); training in-service teachers to work with disadvantaged and handicapped youth (21%); exchange of education-industrial personnel (9%); developing teachers for career education (6%); and recruitment and training of teachers from other fields for vocational education (19%).

10. Approximately 15 States supported projects relative to the development of counseling and guidance personnel with occupational awareness and knowledge of the utilization of occupational information for placement.

Emphasis was placed on the development, implementation, and improvement of comprehensive, statewide systems for vocational education with expansion to include career education. Special efforts were made to upgrade vocational education personnel training in institutions of higher education. Under Section 553 of the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA), State systems received grants of a minimum of $34,000, with larger States receiving commensurately higher amounts proportionate to their unmet needs as reflected in their approved State plan for Vocational Education. These programs are substantially directed to support a major focus in improving the quality of ongoing and projected vocational educational programs. The fellowship program under Section 552 of the Education Professions Development Act has been broadened to include a wide array of leadership development activities. The present program is continued with an emphasis on the midmanagement level. The program stresses increasing leadership capabilities in local education agencies, State departments of education, institutions of higher education and related agencies to enable them to provide for development and coordination of career education personnel development for all educational levels. At present there are eighteen institutions continuing their graduate level program being supported by Federal funds and a number of leadership personnel being supported with State funds.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Ohio State University is currently developing an evaluation system for vocational education leadership and development activities for all State programs. It is anticipated that the system will be flexible enough to adapt the evaluation needs of each State. After completion of this developmental effort it is anticipated that training of State leadership will be conducted in the interests of implementing the model.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data.
2. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.
3. An Evaluation System for Vocational Education Leadership and Professional Development Activities Ohio State University.

F. Library Programs

1. Library Services
2. Public Library Construction
3. Interlibrary Cooperative Services
4. Academic Library Resources
5. Career Training - Libraries
6. Library Demonstrations
7. School Library Resources
8. Undergraduate Instructional Equipment
9. Elementary and Secondary Equipment and Minor Remodeling

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Library Services

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Library Services and Construction Act, Title I, as amended by P.L. 91-600 (and Title IV-A and IV-B to 1972)	FY 1976

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
Beginning in 1972, State Institutionalized Services (Title IV-A) and Services to the Physically Handicapped (Title IV-B) were combined under Title I.	1965	$ 25,000,000	$ 25,000,000
	1966	25,000,000	25,000,000
	1967	35,000,000	35,000,000
	1968	45,000,000	35,000,000
	1969	55,000,000	35,000,000
	1970	65,000,000	29,750,000
	1971	75,000,000	35,000,000
	1972	112,000,000	46,000,000
	1973	117,000,000	62,000,000 1/
	1974	123,500,000	44,155,000
(Old Title IV-A)			
	1967	5,000,000	350,000
	1968	7,500,000	2,120,000
	1969	10,000,000	2,094,000
	1970	12,500,000	2,094,000
	1971	15,000,000	2,094,000
	1972	See above	See above
(Old Title IV-B)			
	1967	3,000,000	250,000
	1968	4,000,000	1,320,000
	1969	5,000,000	1,334,000
	1970	6,000,000	1,334,000
	1971	7,000,000	1,334,000
	1972	See above	See above

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides support to States through basic and matching formula grants to assist them in providing library services to areas without such services or areas with inadequate services; to assist in improving quality of information services including services to specialized groups such as

---

1/ $32,000,000 of the 1973 appropriation was impounded and not released until FY 1974. Program data for FY 1973 in this report reflect the FY 1973 expenditure of $30,000,000.

the disadvantaged, the physically handicapped, and those in State public institutions; to strengthen public library administration at the State level; to strengthen metropolitan public libraries which serve as national or regional resource centers; and to plan programs and projects to extend and improve service.

The Federal share ranges from 33% to 66% except for the Trust territories which is 100% Federally funded, and States must match in proportion to their per capita income. States must maintain the same level of fiscal effort for handicapped and institutionalized library service that existed prior to the combination of these programs under the new amendments (FY 1971 level).

Program Scope:

General data for this program are as follows:	1973 Estimated
1. Population with access to LSCA services (in thousands)	87,000
2. Disadvantaged persons with access to LSCA services (in thousands)	23,500
3. Number of State institutionalized persons served by LSCA	733,700
4. Number of handicapped persons served by LSCA	275,000
5. Number of Right-to-Read projects supported by LSCA	68
6. Number of Drug Abuse projects supported by LSCA	112
7. Number of Environmental Education projects supported by LSCA	56

Program Effectiveness:

The first study of the impact of Title I services, covering the period from 1964 to 1968, was made by the System Development Corporation. In reviewing the LSCA activities in 11 States it found that most projects felt handicapped by: lack of manpower; lack of coordination among public libraries and other educational agencies; need for research in determining whether "disadvantaged projects" were reaching their goals; lack of understanding on the part of the public library's potential and actual services; lack of ability of libraries to react quickly to public demands for more services; and lack of suitable measurements of library performances.

The Behavioral Science Corporation study identified, field visited, and evaluated public library service to disadvantaged in selected cities. These projects were not limited, however, to Title I projects. This pilot study of 15 local library projects for the urban disadvantaged, utilizing user and non-user interview for evaluation, recommended that libraries find better ways to coordinate with schools when dealing with disadvantaged children. The successful programs were characterized by the inclusion of some or all of the following: active participation by the target group; emphasis on audio-visual rather than print materials; and the fact that the program had been viewed as a significant service by the adults in the community.

A major evaluation study to determine how the Library Service and Construction Act, Titles I & II is meeting the public library needs of special clientele groups, e.g., disadvantaged, ethnic minorities, handicapped, and institutionalized persons was conducted by SDC. The project has surveyed all State Library Agencies, all known ongoing projects directed toward these groups, and discontinued projects. Fifty-five representative sites were field visited and library and related agency personnel were interviewed as well as library users and non-users. This study provides an inventory of projects, a needs assessment, and recommendations for change. Over 1600 projects were identified and queried. It was found that many projects classified as discontinued (due to the loss of LSCA funding) where operational, but being funded from State or local monies. A methodology specifying criteria to adjudge program effectiveness was developed, and was tested and validated with the examined projects.

The report stated:

> "It is evident from the data gathered in this project that LSCA projects directed toward special clienteles have been successful, to some extent. More projects are successful than unsuccessful, and fairly significant numbers of special clientele groups have been reached. It is also evident that some projects are far from successful. Many important needs are not being met, or are barely being met, even by projects judged successful...
>
> In many States it was evident that were Federal funds not available, there would be no projects whatsoever for special clienteles. Indeed, in one State plan that was examined the statement was made that, while there were special clienteles in the State, no projects need be directed towards them because the State intended to give service to all of its citizens on an equal basis. That naive attitude represents--all too frequently--the lack of knowledge and concern that exists at many levels of State and local government. Library services for special clienteles are not the same as the traditional, we-await-the-knowledgeable-user, attitude provides. Special clienteles frequently need to be educated to become users, and persuaded that the library has something of value for them. LSCA funds have been a critical factor in projects for special clienteles, and they have provided the bulk of the funds being used

> for innovative projects; without LSCA (or a real substitute) there would be little or no innovation--in short, a rather static, even moribund public library in the U.S."

A major study of "The Public Library and Federal Policy was performed by SDC. This study assessed the current total national public library situation utilizing existing data and included recommendations for further data collection efforts in areas of current information deficiencies.

The final report stated,

> "In this study we examined the past and present status of the public library and likely directions for the future. Based upon our examination of the public library as an information-providing institution, and our certainty that free access to all kinds of information is a requirement of a democratic society and a necessity for individual well being, we have recommended certain courses of action for the Federal government...
>
> Two major directions for library development have emerged from the current study. The first is toward greater efficiency. This can be accomplished through system organization, which will allow centralization of certain functions, through improved internal management and organization, and through staff training.
>
> The second direction is toward greater specialization and differentiation of services among public libraries. This can be accomplished through organization of public libraries with all other kinds of libraries and through cooperation between public libraries and non-library agencies for the purpose of providing special educational services.
>
> The Federal government has played a role in recent years of helping the public library to organize into systems and to provide services to segments of the population who were previously unserved. While there are indications that Federal programs suffered from insufficient coordination, insufficient evaluation, and inadequate funding, there is much evidence to demonstrate that a strong impetus toward system organization and the provision of services to special clienteles was provided by Federal intervention.
>
> It is our (SDC's) belief that continued Federal intervention is necessary. Local communities and individual states, acting independently, cannot supply the coordination, direction, and support that is required to exploit the potential of the public library for providing information and education services during the coming decade."

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing evaluation studies directly related to this program. No further evaluation studies in this area are planned.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. *Overview of LSCA Title I*, by System Development Corporation, Published by Bowker, 1968.

2. *A Study of Public Library Service to the Disadvantaged in Selected Cities*, by Claire Lipsman and contracted to Behaviors Science Corporation, 1970.

3. *Study of Exemplary Public Library Reading and Reading Related Programs for Children*, Youth and Adults, by Bars, Reitzel & Assoc. Inc., 1972.

4. *Evaluation of LSCA Services to Special Target Groups*, by System Development Corporation, July 1973.

5. *The Public Library and Federal Policy* by System Development Corporation, Final Report, April 1973.

6. *Basic Issues in the Governmental Financing of Public Library Services*, Government Studies and Systems, May 1973.

7. *Various Library Demonstration Projects*: These projects are designed to survey and analyze the public library and information services to the American Indian, the aging, and the information needs of the rural and urban poor.

8. Program Operational Data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Public Library Construction

Legislation:

Library Services and Construction Act,
Title II, as amended by P.L. 91-600

Expiration Date:

FY 1976

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$ 30,000,000	$ 30,000,000
1966	30,000,000	30,000,000
1967	40,000,000	40,000,000
1968	50,000,000	21,185,000
1969	60,000,000	9,185,000
1970	70,000,000	7,807,250
1971	80,000,000	7,092,500
1972	80,000,000	9,500,000
1973	84,000,000	15,000,000
1974	88,000,000	-0- [1]

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds to States on a matching basis to support the construction of public libraries. Funds may be used for the construction of new buildings, for additions to existing building and for renovation or alteration of existing buildings or for the acquisition of an existing facility to be used for public library purposes. Grants are made to States on a formula basis. The Federal share ranges from 33% to 66%, except for the Trust Territory which is 100% Federally funded and States must match in proportion to their per capita income.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

From the program's inception in 1965 through 1973, 1,876 projects totaling $160,000,000 have been supported adding more than 20.7 million square feet of floor space. State and local agencies will have contributed approximately $395,000,000 in support of these projects. About 1.2 million square feet of new or renovated public library floor space was added in 1973 with the $2,585,539 carryover money from FY 1972.

---

[1] $15 million will be available as a carryover from FY 1973 impounded funds.

Program Effectiveness:

A recently completed study "Evaluation of LSCA Services to Special Target Groups," in a section entitled "Factors Associated With Program Success" identified facilities as one of several important factors for program success. The report states:

> "The second important factor in project success seems to be appropriate facilities. It seemed that projects that might otherwise have made a significant impact did not do so, in some cases, because the project lacked separate facilities that could be identified as project facilities by the target group. Lack of identifiable project facilities is not always bad, since some successful projects were found using branch library facilities. However, the existing branches in these cases almost always had both a flexible interior and a flexible director, and project activities that were apparent to the target groups, even though carried out within the normal facilities. Even if project facilities are sometimes located in what seem to be makeshift and unsuitable quarters, the fact that they are separate and identifiable makes for success in spite of their temporary, crowded, or otherwise negative aspects. In general, then, the target groups must be able to "identify" the project facilities in some way.

This would indicate that the additional library space has met a critical need.

Ongoing and Planned:

There are no ongoing or planned evaluation studies directly related to this program.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation of Library Services and Construction Act Services to Specialized Target Groups, by System Development Corporation, July 1973.

2. Program Operational Data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Interlibrary Cooperative Services

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Library Services and Construction Act, Title III, as amended by P.L. 91-600	FY 1976

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1967	$5,000,000	$ 375,000
	1968	7,500,000	2,375,000
	1969	10,000,000	2,281,000
	1970	12,500,000	2,281,000
	1971	15,000,000	2,281,000
	1972	15,000,000	2,634,500
	1973	15,000,000	7,500,000[1/]
	1974	16,500,000	2,594,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds through formula grants to States to establish and maintain local, regional, State or interstate cooperative networks, of libraries for the coordination of informational services of school, public, academic, and special libraries and information centers, permitting the user of any one type of library to draw on all libraries and information centers. No State matching is required.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In 1973, an estimated 120 cooperative projects were supported, the same number as in FY 1972. Nearly 9000 libraries were involved in these projects. Participation by all classes of libraries in telecommunications or information processing systems has increased. Also, regional planning within States as well as multistate planning for coordination of library services is increasing.

1/ $4,770,000 of the 1973 appropriation was impounded and not released until FY 1974. Program data for FY 1973 in this report reflects the FY 1973 expenditure of $2,730,000.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No evaluation studies are yet underway in this area.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Program Operational Data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Academic Library Resources

Legislation: Expiration Data:

Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-A 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$ 50,000,000	$ 10,000,000
1967	50,000,000	25,000,000
1968	50,000,000	25,000,000
1969	25,000,000	25,000,000
1970	75,000,000	9,816,000
1971	90,000,000	9,900,000
1972	90,000,000	10,944,000
1973	75,000,000	12,466,000
1974	56,670,000	9,975,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds to institutions of higher education to assist and encourage them in the acquisition of library resources -- books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials. Three types of grants are awarded to eligible institutions of higher education: (1) Basic grants of up to $5,000, provided that the applicant expends at least the same amount from institutional funds for library resources; (2) Supplemental grants of up to $20 per student, provided that the applicant meets the eligibility terms for a Basic grant; and (3) Special Purpose grants, unrestricted as to the amount requested but which must be matched with $1 of institutional funds for library resources for every $3 of Federal funds requested. For both the Basic and Special Purpose grant categories, applicants must meet maintenance-of-effort requirements in two areas -- total library purposes and library resources -- as follows: in the Fiscal Year of application, the applicant must expend, or plan to expend, an amount equal to or in excess of the average of the two fiscal years preceding the year of application for total library purposes; in the Fiscal Year of application, the applicant must expend, or plan to expend, an amount equal to or in excess of the average of the two fiscal years preceding the year of application for library resources. Under certain circumstances, a waiver may be granted from maintenance-of-effort requirements. In the case of Special Purpose grants, the matching share must be in addition to the base two-year average for library resources institutional expenditures.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In Fiscal Year 1973, the Education Amendments of 1972 mandated that Basic grants be given first priority for consideration. Additionally, other library agencies are now eligible for Basic and Special Purpose grants, provided that they primarily serve the academic community on a formal, cooperative basis. As a result, 2051 such awards were made totalling $10.1 million and averaging almost $5,000 per award. The remaining funds were awarded to 60 institutions and consortia for Special Purpose grants totalling almost $2.4 million. In both grant areas, funds were utilized to satisfy critical needs in special curriculum areas and in providing additional resources to disadvantaged students and to the preparation of students to better serve the disadvantaged.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing or planned evaluation studies directly related to this program.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program Operational Data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Career Training - Libraries

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-B	FY 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION*	APPROPRIATION
	1966	$15,000,000	$1,000,000
	1967	15,000,000	3,750,000
	1968	15,000,000	8,250,000
	1969	11,000,000	8,250,000
	1970	28,000,000	6,833,000
	1971	38,000,000	3,900,000
	1972	38,000,000	1,939,000
	1973	15,000,000	3,558,000
	1974	18,890,000	2,850,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants to institutions of higher education to support training and retraining of librarians and information scientists, including paraprofessionals, for service in all types of libraries and information centers. Professional training is accomplished through short and long-term institutes, traineeships, and pre- and post-baccalaureate fellowships.

The Education Amendments of 1972, effective with Fiscal Year 73 program operations, required that at least 50% of all program funds be used to support fellowships and traineeships. Also, other library agencies and associations are now eligible to submit proposals for consideration.

In addition, the amendments now require a statutory distribution of funds between the college library resources and the library demonstration and training programs. Of the amount appropriated for demonstration and training under Title II-B, 66-2/3 percent must be used for library training.

Program Scope:

Between 1966 and 1970, the program awarded 2,700 fellowships and traineeships, and provided institute training funds for 11,070 participants. In 1971, the program was redirected to provide more responsive library services to disadvantaged and minority groups by retraining librarians and training members of minority and disadvantaged groups so that they might enter into the library profession as professionals and/or paraprofessionals. The primary focus of this redirection was to achieve change in the system for preparation and utilization of library manpower to be more responsive to the informational needs of the disadvantaged.

---

* Combined authorization with Library Research and Demonstration until FY 1972.

Of special note have been several institutes which either recruited Native Americans into the profession or retrained existing library personnel in more effective service to the Native American. These institutes, operating in the Southwest, will strengthen and support educational and informational services to a disadvantaged populace. Also of note has been the minority recruitment efforts throughout the Nation which have brought a higher percentage of Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Oriental Americans and Native Americans into the mainstream of the profession.

Program Effectiveness:

Two formal evaluation studies of this program have been made. The first in FY 1969 by the Bureau of Social Science was restricted to the fellowship program. It found at that time that all 3 types of graduate support (the masters, post masters and Ph.D. programs) were accomplishing their intended goals; however, the study indicated that the master's program was most effective out of the three studied for bringing in new personnel to library areas outside of the academic library field. The second study was performed by Rutgers University and examined the institute program. Interviews were conducted with institute directors, Regional Program Officers, and the staff from the library bureau. It was found that the area of greatest institute impact is in the area of school media personnel (a specialist who integrates print and non-print resources with the formal learning experience).

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no evaluation studies planned for this area in the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Overview of the Library Fellowship Program; by the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. of Washington, D.C., 1970

Data Collection and Description of HEA Title II-B Institutes, by Rutgers, 1972

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Library Demonstrations

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965 Title II-B	FY 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1967	(See library training authorization)	$3,500,000
	1968		3,500,000
	1969		2,000,000
	1970		2,100,000
	1971		2,171,000
	1972		2,000,000
	1973		1,785,000
	1974		1,425,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds through grants and contracts to improve libraries and information science by demonstration and dissemination. The impetus provided by the redirection of 1971 continues to focus support on improving services to the disadvantaged. This program now funds projects conducting field demonstrations of new delivery systems that would facilitate access to and sustain the knowledge and informational needs of critically deprived persons.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 1973 24 projects were funded, representing both continuations and new starts. A representation of the wide diversity of the type of projects funded, their purpose, and their intended audiences is described below.

Three goals (not mutually exclusive) that principally characterize the demonstration activities sponsored under HEA, II-B are: adaption of traditional study, in all its applications to human career development, through library services; the creation of technical support for systems; and the design of testing delivery systems compatible with critical needs.

Non-traditional sutdy is represented through a grant to the College Entrance Examination Board through their Office of Library and Independent Studies. Twelve metropolitan libraries serve as experimental sites and furnish an information and data base to support models which will be compatible for adaption by larger libraries generally.

The following are examples of specific operating demonstrations in developing concepts useful to library participation: 1) the triangle project in North Carolina, composed of a small State Univeristy, a Technical Institute and a three county regional public libraries which cooperate on a recruitment and support program of Adult Basic Education; 2) the Vermont Community College (actually a State network) has in their project formed with six public libraires a consortium based upon components of community education. It will serve as the community college library center providing materials to students in the adult basic education curriculum, and to townspeople.

The design of a new delivery system is supported through the following: 1) the Washington State Library is making an inquiry into the feasibility of a state-wide system for the delivery of books by mail; 2) in Atlanta the Cooperative College Library Center (as a satellite of the Ohio College Library Center) now is replicating the Ohio model whose objective is to decrease the cost of library materials and of technical processing.

In Fiscal Year 1973, a major share of program funds, went into networking. One example is the completely urban operational consortium (Cleveland, Atlanta, Queens, Houston, Detroit) supporting information demonstrations.

Information needs of the American Indian Community are being met experimentally in an Indian consoritum operating at Standing Rock (Sioux); Rough Rock (Navajo) and Akwasesne (Huron). Appalachian people in 5 States are participating in the experimental design of a network system for rural isolates. Both the demonstration activities and training activities are coordinated programs under HEA, Title II-B.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing or planned evaluation studies directly related to this program.

Sources of Evaluation Studies:

Individual Project evaluative data

Program Name:

School Library Resources

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (P.L. 89-10, P.L. 89-750, P.L. 90-247, P.L. 91-230, P.L. 92-318)	June 1973 (program operated in FY 1974 under automatic extension authorized by P.L. 90-247)

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$ 100,000,000	$ 100,000,000
1967	125,000,000	102,000,000
1968	150,000,000	99,234,000
1969	162,500,000	50,000,000
1970	200,000,000	42,500,000
1971	200,000,000	80,000,000
1972	210,000,000	90,000,000
1973	220,000,000	100,000,000
1974	-	90,250,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of ESEA Title II is to provide school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. Approved plans are in effect for 50 States, the District of Columbia, five outlying areas, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Plans include assurance of: administration of the program under relative need and selection criteria; equitable treatment of the private sector; and maintenance of effort. Plans remain in effect from year to year but are amended to reflect material changes in program. During FY 1973, amendments were reviewed and approved in accordance with a section of the Education Amendments of 1972 that required that in administering Title II, equal consideration be given to the needs of elementary and secondary schools for instructional materials to be used in instruction, orientation, and guidance and counseling in occupational education.

The Title II program consists of two components — acquisition of materials and administration. The acquisition program includes the purchase, lease-purchase, or straight lease of instructional materials and the necessary costs of ordering, processing, cataloging materials and delivery of them to the initial place at which they are made available for use. Administration includes those executive, supervisory, and management responsibilities vested in State education agencies necessary to carry out State plans. Five percent of the amount paid to the State, or $50,000, whichever is greater, is available for administration of the State plan.

Program Scope:

Information about Title II comes from the annual reports from State departments of education used each fiscal year as the basis for program reports and from other publications on the program (See Sources of Evaluative Data following).

The reports show that very nearly all eligible public and private school children have benefitted. Title II is the foremost OE program providing aid to private school children.

Fiscal Year	Public School Children (in millions) Eligible	Participating	Percent	Private School Children (in millions) Eligible	Participating	Percent
1966	40.3	37.4	93.4	5.9	5.7	92.2
1967	42.2	39.1	93.0	5.6	5.5	98.0
1968	43.6	39.9	91.0	5.5	5.3	95.0
*1969	43.7	38.0	86.0	5.4	5.3	98.0
1970	43.7	38.0	86.0	5.3	5.2	98.0
1971	43.8	38.0	86.0	5.4	5.0	95.0
1972	43.8	42.2	96.0	5.4	5.3	98.0
1973	44.6	43.1	96.0	5.4	5.3	98.0
1974	44.6	43.1	96.0	5.4	5.3	98.0

*Data after FY 1968 are based on estimates

Funds expended for materials under Title II are shown below. The proportion expended for audiovisual media has risen from 19 to 50 percent over a nine-year period, indicating significant interest and effort to use audiovisual media in elementary and secondary school teaching and learning. All media made available under the program has provided the increased quantities needed for innovative new teaching strategies, e.g., modular and flexible scheduling, individualized programs, interdisciplinary courses, inquiry learning, and simulation and games teaching.

Fiscal Year	Trade books		Other Printed Media		Textbooks		AV		Total	
	Amount (in millions)	%	Amount (in millions)	%	Amount (in millions)	%	Amount (in millions)	%	Amount (in millions)	%
1966	$64.0	74.8	$2.2	2.6	$2.9	3.4	$16.4	19.2	$85.5	
1967	62.0	69.7	2.4	2.7	3.1	3.5	21.4	24.1	88.9	
1968	59.1	67.5	2.0	2.3	2.1	2.4	24.5	27.9	87.7	
1969	29.1	65.3	1.6	3.6	1.6	3.6	12.3	27.6	44.6	
1970	22.2	65.7	1.5	4.4	0.2	0.6	9.9	29.3	33.8	
1971	38.3	59.4	1.6	2.5	1.0	1.6	23.6	36.6	64.5	
1972	41.2	55.0	2.3	3.1	0.7	0.9	30.7	41.0	74.9	
*1973	43.2	46.0	2.9	3.1	0.9	1.0	47.0	50.0	94.0	
*1974	38.7	46.0	2.5	3.0	.9	1.1	42.1	50.0	84.2	
Total	$397.8	60.4	$19.0	2.9	$13.4	2.0	$227.9	34.6	$658.1	

*Estimated

Program Effectiveness:

Major findings on program impact from program reports are:

1. The program has aided the education of economically, culturally, and otherwise disadvantaged children, and to all children who attend schools with insufficient quantities of instructional materials.
2. Title II has been useful in strengthening educational quality and opportunity by providing media necessary for the introduction of new subjects to the curriculum, e.g. environmental/ecological studies, career education, early childhood education, and American studies.
3. Many children now have the use of certain types of educational media for the first time, e.g. 8mm films, tape cassettes, transparencies, art prints, and paperback books, which assist teachers to adjust learning to individual needs.

4. The proportion of public elementary schools with media centers has increased significantly.

5. Title II not only supplemented State, local, and private support for instructional materials but actually stimulated increased support. The program also stimulated employment for large numbers of professional, para-professional, and clerical media personnel.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Collection of data on expenditures and pupil participation will be continued via the Consolidated Program Information Report (national sample) and a State Aggregated Program Data Supplement.

Sources of Evaluative Data:

1. First Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1966, ESEA Title II (OE-20108)
2. Second Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1967, ESEA Title II (OE-10108-67)
3. Third Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1968, ESEA Title II (OE-20108-68)
4. The Federal-State Partnership for Education, pp. 67-97 (OE-23050-70)
5. State Departments of Education and Federal Programs, pp. 98-125 (OE-72-68)
6. Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1972, ESEA Title II (OE 73-21103)
7. Descriptive Case Studies of Nine Elementary School Media Centers in Three Inner Cities (OE-30021)
8. Emphasis on Excellence in School Media Programs (OE-20123)
9. How ESEA Title II Meets The Needs of Poor Children; A Special Report.
10. An Evaluative Survey Report on ESEA Title II Fiscal Years 1966-68. Part I - Analysis and Interpretation; Part II - Tables.
11. Notable Reading Projects, 11 issues, March 1971 - Jan. March, 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Undergraduate Instructional Equipment

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VI-A	FY 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$35,000,000	$15,000,000
1967	50,000,000	14,500,000
1968	60,000,000	14,500,000
1969	60,000,000	14,500,000
1970	60,000,000	-0-
1971	60,000,000	7,000,000
1972	60,000,000	12,500,000
1973	60,000,000	12,500,000[1/]
1974	60,000,000	11,875,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction in institutions of higher education by providing financial assistance on a matching basis for the acquisition of instructional equipment, materials and related minor remodeling. Funds are allocated to the States by a formula based on higher education enrollment and per capita income. State commissions rank applications submitted by the institutions and recommend the Federal share which, except in hardship cases, may not exceed 50 percent of the total project cost.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

Eligibility under the program now includes post-secondary vocational schools and community colleges.

Program statistics reflect this program redirection. Over one third of the 1107 grants awarded in 1972 were made to such post-secondary institutions: 222 grants totaling $1.5 million were made for closed circut TV installations under this program. Between fiscal year 1966 and 1972, about 5500 individual project grants were made.

[1/] No FY 1973 grants have been made. Release of impounded funds await legal decision and administrative release.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing or planned evaluation studies directly related to this program.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program operating data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Elementary and Secondary Equipment and Minor Remodeling.

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
NDEA Title III (P.L. 85-864), as amended	June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$ 100,000,000	$ 76,600,000
1966	110,000,000	88,200,000
1967	110,000,000	88,200,000
1968	120,000,000	82,700,000
1969	120,000,000	78,740,000
1970	130,500,000	37,740,000
1971	140,500,000	50,000,000
1972	140,500,000	50,000,000
1973	140,500,000	50,000,000
1974	140,500,000	28,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Fiscal 1973 was the 15th year in which the program funded under title III-A of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) supported the improvement of instruction through the purchase of equipment and materials and minor remodeling and through administrative services provided by State departments of education. The number of eligible academic subject areas increased from 3 to 12: the arts, civics, economics, English, geography, history, the humanities, industrial arts, mathematics, modern foreign languages, reading, and science.

NDEA is a matching program. The Federal share is up to one-half of the expenditures for acquisition of equipment, materials, and minor remodeling, and for administration of the State plan. Local education agencies pay a share of the costs of projects approved by the State departments of education and are reimbursed for the remaining amount by Federal funds.

Section 303(a)(2) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and the title III-A Regulations, require the State plan to develop principles for determining the priority of projects to be approved. The principles should reflect consideration of the State's educational goals and State standards, the total general educational need in the academic subjects named in title III-A, the special instructional needs which the program may serve, the special requirements for equipment and facilities in each of the subject areas and grade levels, and the categories of eligible equipment, and materials, and types of allowable minor remodeling.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In fiscal year 1972, a majority of States formulated general objectives which usually included strengthening instruction in the academic subjects by assisting local education agencies to acquire equipment and materials, improving supervisory and related services, conducting needs assessment, and improving evaluation procedures. Some States cited specific priorities among the academic subjects, giving emphasis for example, to reading and ecological problems in relation to science and social studies. Some stressed services for the disadvantaged and handicapped, the slow learner, and the gifted. Many emphasized improved and innovative teaching strategies and enrichment of curriculums through the use of multi-media.

Management activities undertaken to achieve the objectives formulated in each State for administration of the NDEA title III-A program include the cooperation of supervisors and subject area specialists in needs assessment, planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and dissemination of projects. All States prepare guidelines and forms for project applications, procedures and criteria for reviewing and approving projects, curriculum guides, and standards for media and equipment. They also provide inservice training in the use of equipment and materials.

The Federal allotment for administration of the NDEA title III-A program amounted in fiscal year 1972 to $2 million. Of this amount, $1.5 million was expended by State departments of education for administration and supervisory and related services, with $471,330 carried over for expenditure in fiscal year 1973. Federal expenditures were more than matched by State department of education expenditures of $2.6 million. Administrative funds are used for such items as salaries of professional and clerical staff assigned to the program, for workshops and conferences dealing with instruction in the academic subjects, staff travel, office equipment, and other equipment used for State programs of supervision in the academic subjects.

Federal, State, and local total expenditures in fiscal year 1972 under the NDEA title III program for equipment, materials, and minor remodeling used to strengthen instruction in the academic subjects amounted to $86.9 million. Of this amount, $85.3 million went for equipment and materials, with less than 2 percent used for minor remodeling. Equipment purchased included audiovisual equipment such as projectors, recording equipment, and television receivers and recorders, and laboratory and other equipment such as microscopes, planetariums, biological slides and models, tachistoscopes, individual reading pacers, and laboratory apparatus for physical construction of mathematical models. Materials purchased were such items as 8 and 16mm films, filmstrips, tape and disc recordings, books, maps, globes, charts, instructional games, and pamphlets and periodicals.

The Federal allotment for equipment, materials, and minor remodeling in fiscal year 1972 was $47,750,000. A total of $40.9 million (85.6 percent of the allotment) was reported expended, with $6.8 million carried over for expenditure in fiscal year 1973. State and local funds used for the same purposes to match Federal expenditures amounted to $45.5 million.

Although the bulk of NDEA title III funds has been spent for years to purchase equipment and materials for strengthening instruction in the natural sciences, expenditures for English and reading instruction ranked first in fiscal year 1972, amounting to $26.4 million. Expenditures for natural sciences and social sciences ranked second and third with expenditures amounting to $21.4 million and $12.9 million, respectively. Among the seven subject areas, expenditures for equipment and materials for use in mathematics and modern foreign language instruction ranked lowest.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

State departments of education conduct State-wide and individual project assessments whenever these are considered appropriate. Many States require that procedures for evaluation of projects be included in project applications.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. USOE, NDEA Title III, Fiscal Year 1959-67, A Management View, May 1969.

2. "Strengthening Instruction in Science, Mathematics, Foreign Languages, and the Humanities and Arts," A chapter appearing in the The Federal-State Partnership for Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, May 1970.

3. USOE, Program Statistics compiled by the U.S. Office of Education.

4. USOE, Strengthening Instruction In Academic Subjects, Title III, Part A, National Defense Education Act as Amended, Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1972, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1973.

G. Educational Technology Programs

1. Educational Broadcasting Facilities
2. Sesame Street and Electric Company

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Broadcasting Facilities

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Communciations Act of 1934, as amended Title III, Part IV	FY 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	)$32,000,000	$13,000,000
	1966	) for 5-year	8,826,000
	1967	period 63-67	3,304,000*
	1968	10,500,000	-0-
	1969	12,500,000	4,000,000
	1970	15,000,000	4,321,000
	1971	15,000,000	11,000,000
	1972	15,000,000	13,000,000
	1973	25,000,000	13,000,000
	1974	25,000,000	15,675,000

*remaining amount available of $32 mil authorization.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Matching funds are provided for the acquisition of transmission apparatus necessary for initial activation or expansion of noncommercial broadcasting facilities to serve educational, cultural, and informational needs in homes and schools. Up to 75 percent matching grants are made to eligible tax supported institutions (such as school districts, colleges and universities); State Educational Broadcasting Agencies; nonprofit foundations, etc., organized primarily to operate a noncommercial broadcasting facility; and municipalities which own or operate a facility used only for noncommercial educational broadcasting. No State may receive more than 8-1/2 percent of the appropriation in any one year.

The major goal of this program is to stimulate the development of broadcast facilities necessary for a nation-wide system of noncommercial educational public broadcasting stations capable technically and programmatically of serving local, State, and national needs; and to make available a state-of-the-art noncommercial broadcast service capable of producing quality local programs.

Program Scope:

In Fiscal Year 1973, 78 noncommercial Educational Radio (ER) and Educational Television (ETV) stations receive grant support under this program. Forty eight grants were for ETV: 8 grants for new activations and 40 grants for expansion or improvement of an existing facility. The remaining 30 grants were made to ER stations and represented 10 new starts and 20 grants for upgrading. The total number of noncommercial television stations on the air or under construction increased from 76 in 1963 to 240 by the end of FY 1973. During this same period 187 of the existing noncommercial television stations improved or expanded their facilities with Federal assistance. The number of full-service public radio stations in the country has increased from 40 in 1969, when Federal assistance to noncommercial radio stations was first made available, to 146 on-the-air or under construction at the end of FY 1973. Sixty-three of these radio stations utilized Federal assistance to expand and/or improve their facilities to become full-service community stations. Approximately 79% of the households in the U.S. are within the coverage of a noncommerical television signal; about 50% are served by noncommercial radio. However, 37 of the major metropolitan areas of the country are without full-service public radio service. Much of the unserved population can be found in small rural areas.

Program Effectiveness:

In the 10 years of Federal participation, the failure rate of stations which have become operational with help from the Federal Government has been zero. No station established or expanded with EBFP assistance has ceased operation, and in virtually every year the operating budgets -- not supported by EBFP -- have increased.

Many of the noncommercial broadcast stations are able to receive the network program services provided by the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). The interconnection of stations, 4 out of 5 of which were activated with Federal assistance, has been highly beneficial to local stations by providing them with quality evening programs to augment local productions thereby lowering operating costs. Approximately 53% of the nations schools receive instructional programs and 57% of elementary and secondary students use educational telecasts according to a recent survey.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies

The Program (EBFP) utilizes studies conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics in the continuation of systematic awarding of Federal assistance and in the planning and development of needed broadcast facilities. Five kinds of basic data are collected: (a) financial and programming, (b) employee, (c) station and transmission facilities and broadcast data, and (e) management personnel. The Program plans improvements in identifying data needs by continuing close communication and coordination with all organizations which carry out research in the field of telecommunications.

Just finishing for the Office of Education by Battelle's Columbus Laboratories is A PLANNING STUDY - THE FUTURE OF EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS.
reports indicate that the study will conclude that public telecommunications have great potential, but to fulfill that potential there is a need for re-examining goals, broadening current guidelines to take advantage of new technology, improving distribution capabilities, and setting minimum standards for production facilities. It is expected that the report will recommend -- at least for EBFP -- that primary emphases be focused on extended and improved transmission, and the funding of production capabilities must be carefully balanced between the need for substantial pools of talent and equipment and the desire for local activity.

Sources of Evaluation Studies:

1) EBFP Historical Operating Data

2) Surveys of existing facilities made by the National Center for Educational Statistics

3) Corporation for Public Broadcasting surveys and studies

4) National Association for Educational Broadcasting research studies.

5) A Planning Study -- The Future of Educational Telecommunications February, 1974, Battelle's Columbus Laboratories.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Sesame Street and the Electric Company
(Children's Television Workshop)[1]

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Cooperative Research Act (P.L. 83-531) as amended	FY 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization[2]	Appropriation
	1971	Indefinite	$2,600,000
	1972	Indefinite	7,000,000
	1973	Indefinite	6,000,000
	1974	Indefinite	3,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Children's Television Workshop is an independent, nonprofit organization. It is supported by grants and contributions from Federal and private sources, with the U.S. Office of Education and The Corporation for Public Broadcasting as the main Federal contributors. CTW created and produced SESAME STREET, which is now in its fifth year of operation, and THE ELECTRIC COMPANY, which is in its third year.

SESAME STREET is an educational television program targeted at preschool, disadvantaged children. Its major objective is to prepare the nation's three, four, and five year olds with an educational experience which would prepare them for school by stimulating their appetite for learning. From season to season SESAME STREET has expanded its goals to include the child's understanding of symbolic representation, his cognitive processes, his reasoning and problem solving ability, and his understanding of his world. SESAME STREET will continue to focus on the broad spectrum of cognitive, social, and emotional capabilities which seem most likely to help prepare its viewers for school based on evaluative research and audience analysis of the programs during the previous four years. The curriculum runs five hours per week for 26 weeks and is carried on the 230 public television stations and on about 50 commercial television stations in communities beyond the range of public television. This network now reaches 85 percent of the television households in the country.

THE ELECTRIC COMPANY is designed for children in the second, third and fourth grades who are failing to develop the abiliy to read with the major focus on poor readers in second grade. The series is designed to appeal to a nationwide, in-home audience as well as to students in classrooms. Primary emphasis has been reaching children while they are in school, where teachers can facilitate and reinforce the objectives of the series, employing it as a supplement to their reading instruction.

---

[1] This Program is listed in the current budget as Children's Educational Television Support and is not restricted to CTW.

[2] The Cranston Amendment does fix a ceiling on the Cooperative Research authorization; however, it sets no specific component program limits.

Program Scope:

These two television series are estimated to have reached approximately 14 million children last year. About 10 million viewed SESAME STREET at a cost of less than one cent per day, and about 4 million saw THE ELECTRIC COMPANY at a cost comparable to SESAME STREET.

Program Effectiveness:

An evaluation of the cognitive effects by the Educational Testing Service of the first and of the second year found that the program was successful in teaching basic facts and skills to 3, 4, and 5 year-old viewers. This has been borne out by studies of program impact done for CTW, most recently the study of February 1973, by Daniel Yankelovitch, which surveyed viewing in the inner city.

The initial research and planning for THE ELECTRIC COMPANY was completed in 1970 and the program went on the air October, 1971. According to an in-school utilization study conducted by Florida State University, two of every three city schools which have TV receivers and access to the series are tuned in, and the series is being watched in 26 percent of schools in low income areas. The greatest bar to wider utilization is the unavailability of television sets in nearly one half of the elementary school classrooms in the United States. In March, 1973, the Educational Testing Service study of the ELECTRIC COMPANY revealed that students watching the program made significantly greater gains than non-viewing students in the reading skills the program was designed to teach. The program had a clear and significant impact on its primary target audience -- second grade children who were in the bottom half of their class as indicated by standardized reading test scores. The program was also successful on first-grade classes that viewed in school although this grade level was not among the primary target audience. The program was successful in producing gains among first and second grade classes across almost all of the 19 major curriculum areas built into the program and tested in the ETS study and the program has a similar effect on all groups who viewed in school -- Spanish background, blacks, whites, boys, and girls.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Education expects to contract for an evaluation study to examine the Federal role in Children's Educational Television. The study will recommend the level and type of Federal funding for children's educational TV, and the possible impact of this spending. This new study will draw upon existing data, as well as collect new information.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. The First Year of Sesame Street: An Evaluation, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, October, 1970.

2. The Second Year of Sesame Street: A Continuing Evaluation, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, October, 1971.

3. Who Watched the Electric Company, The Electric Company in School Utilization Study: The 1971-72 School and Teacher Survey, Center for the Study of Education, Institute for Social Education, Florida State University, 1972.

4. The Children's Television Workshop: How and Why It Works, Nassau County Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Jericho, New York, 1972.

5. A Summary of the Major Findings from "Reading With Television: An Evaluation of The Electric Company", Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, March, 1973.

6. The Workshop and the World: Toward An Assessment of the Children's Television Workshop, Rand Corporation, October, 1973

H. Special Demonstration Programs

1. Right-to-Read
2. Drug Abuse Education
3. Environmental Education
4. Nutrition and Health
5. Dropout Prevention
6. General Program Dissemination: Office of Public Affairs

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Right-to-Read

Legislation: | **Expiration Date:**

Cooperative Research Act (P.L. 85-531)
as amended

None

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
FY	1971	Indefinite	$ 2,000,000
	1972	Indefinite	12,000,000
	1973	Indefinite	12,000,000
	1974	Indefinite	12,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The long-range goal of the Right-to-Read Program is to increase substantially functional literacy in this country. The ability to read is essential for one to function effectively as an adult in our society, Yet, more than three million adults in the United States are illiterate and approximately 18½ million cannot read well enough to complete simple tasks required for common living needs. Approximately 7 million public school children require special instruction in reading. Even after they have completed high school, one-third to one-half of the new students in junior colleges need some type of reading help.

Through the demonstration of effective and efficient reading programs and the provision of technical assistance, the objective of Right-to-Read is to help all reading programs to become effective, regardless of the source of funding, the level of instruction or the age of the participant This program hopes to influence Federal formula grant and discretionary funds as well as State and local funds, and will involve experimental, demonstration, service and support activities. It will also be responsible for awarding a limited number of grants and contracts.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

The Right-to-Read Program provided support in various ways for State and local participants during FY 73. By the end of the year, 174 school and community-based projects had been funded of which 68 were community-based and 106 were school-based. Thirty-three of the projects were bilingual.

The 68 community-based programs were directed toward the out-of-school adolescent population, the young adult and the older adult in need of reading help. Community-based programs were much more diverse in type of location, population, and program intent, and could be found, for example, in prisons, community colleges, the inner city, and on reservations.

Additional support activities were funded and undertaken during the year. For example, eleven State education agencies were funded to collect and disseminate information on reading programs and to conduct exemplary reading projects focussed on training and technical assistance designed to stimulate more effective reading programs throughout the State.

In addition, funds for technical assistance were awarded to 5 institutions which provided, through educational planners and reading consultants, assistance to the projects in assessing needs, planning and implementing the reading program as well as assisting in internal evaluation.

An evaluative study conducted by Contemporary Research Inc. of 44 of the 106 school-based sites in FY 1973 revealed that 28 of the 44 schools met or exceeded the criterion of one month gain in reading achievement for each month of reading instruction. Seventeen of the 44 schools failed to achieve the objective. Factors contributing to lack of achievement of the goal were: (1) request for extension of deadline for post-testing; (2) pre and post-test data not on the same group of students; (3) different tests used for pre and post tests; (4) scores not converted to grade equivalents; (5) test data not in conformance with Right-to-Read requirements; and (6) late submission of test data. The study is of questionable validity because the sample was clearly not representative and the data aggregated were of the "apples and oranges" variety. In addition, the study makes no provision for determining the statistical significance of reported reading gains.

A team of selected HEW personnel (non-OE) conducted a field review. The team's findings follow:

- Program structure and control - Right-to-Read contracts a major portion of its functions to external organizations, including program development, technical assistance, and data collection/analysis. This emphasis places a premium on systematic program monitoring and quality review. During the study, site-visits to 5 grantees and discussions with Washington staff revealed that several tasks, had not been accomplished -- principally the collection of base-line data on pre-tests and the design and installation of a community-based project monitoring system.

- Technical Assistance - School and community-based projects receive planning and operation support from 5 technical assistance grantees located in various parts of the country. Site-visits indicated that, with the exception of planning efforts, technical assistance occurred on an ad hoc, as requested, basis. Specific deficiencies were noted in the measurement area, where delays in funding pushed back pre-test data collection as much as 9 months and adversely effected subsequent evaluation.

A literature search was conducted which determined the extent and distribution of the National reading problem by identifying, analyzing and summarizing existing survey and test data, determining the frequency of use for various instructional methods, approaches and materials, and describing the nature and extent of current practices in the training of those who teach reading.

A major conclusion of the search was that a better definition of literacy is needed to replace the variety of definitions now in place. The study also recommended that further efforts be directed to the economic consequences of reading, particularly in the adult population. For example, much more needs to be known about the reading requirements of jobs, especially those jobs which could be filled by the currently unemployed and underemployed.

Lessons learned from 1973 experience suggest: (1) the need to develop more uniform measurement of Right-to-Read objectives, (2) more systematic utilization of technical assistance teams services; (3) provide more specific directions to project personnel concerning the conduct of pre and post testing and reporting of scores; (4) provide a time frame and instructions for a Right-to-Read tracking system early in a given fiscal year; (5) shedule at least one monitoring visit to each project to provide technical assistance and process clarification; and (6) increase the amount of support services in the interests of installing effective procedures to maximize reporting capability to Right-to-Read -- Office of Education.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation:

Planning for a pilot evaluation of the community-based projects of the Right-to-Read program is presently underway. The evaluation contract was let to Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation in FY 74. The pre-testing of students was done in the Fall of 1973 and the post-testing will be done in the Spring of 1974. The purpose of the evaluation is to discern the reading gains of the students in the various type projects. The results of this study will allow the program administrators to make some judgements as to what types of projects are more effective and efficient in working with different kinds of students in different settings.

5

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. The Information Base for Reading; 1971.
2. Evaluation of School-Based Right-to-Read Sites. Contemporary Research Incorporated, Los Angeles, California. October 1973.
3. Evaluation of a Sample of Community-Based Right-to-Read Projects. Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation, Berkeley, California, 1973.
4. Briefing Package for The ASE Management Conference -- October 23, 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Drug Abuse Education

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970	1974

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1971	$10,000,000	$ 5,610,000
1972	20,000,000	12,400,000
1973	28,000,000	12,400,000
1974	28,000,000	6,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The principal purpose of the Program is to help schools and communities assess and respond to their drug problems by becoming aware of the nature of the problem and developing strategies aimed at its causes rather than merely its symptoms. The program strongly encourages a coordinated community effort.

Grants to State Departments of Education primarily support in-service training for school personnel, technical assistance, materials development, and information dissemination. Grants to community organizations, local school districts and colleges and universities support a variety of demonstration projects directed at responding to local needs. These often include provision of direct services to youth, education and training programs for youths and adults and information dissemination grants to training centers and to community teams to support training in doing abuse prevention programming and follow up assistance. Technical assistance for programs at each level is provided through the National Committee for Drug Education.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

During the 1972-73 project year, there were 55 State coordination projects which impacted on an estimated 117,000 people through direct service, mostly education and training, and 3.5 million people through a variety of indirect services, such as mass media efforts and the multiplier effect of training trainers. With FY 73 funds, OE program personnel, continued to provide these types of services, as well as cooperating with the designated States Agencies in the development of comprehensive State plans. During this same period, one National and seven Regional Training Centers handled approximately 800 community leadership teams of 5 to 8 members each, who received mini grants to support training approximately 900 teams were trained with FY 73 funds. Finally, 18 college-based and 40 community-based projects furnished education and training to approximately 22,000 youth and adults in schools and in the community; other direct services were provided to over 37,000 young people via hotlines, crisis centers, rap centers, counseling and alternative programs. Most of these projects are continuing to provide services with FY 73 funds.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

At the present time, the National Drug Education Program is implementing an information support system for NDEP. This system provides baseline information on objectives and activities of local projects, identifies discrepancies, and reports resultant changes in objectives or activities. Data is aggregated to meet the needs of each decision-making level. Success is measured in terms of the degree to which objectives are met over time. The system is now operational but continues to undergo refinement and documentation.

A new drug education program centering on teacher training institutions or agencies will be initiated in April 1974. It will develop 5-8 model programs for preservice teachers. Information on the development of the program and its first year's impact will be included in evaluation activities, planned for June 1974 through September 1975.

Extension of the minigrant concept to schools, mostly secondary, as well as communities, will provide training for both at the several drug education traini centers. NDEP plans to review the effectiveness of program operation and team in their school and community environments; evaluation activities are expected to run from May 1974 through August 1975.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Training for "People" Problems: An Assessment of Federal Program Strategies for Training Teachers to Deal with Drug Education; 1971.
2. Drug Abuse Program Report: Program Evaluation by Summer Interns; 1971.
3. National Study of Drug Abuse Education Programs; 1972.
4. Field Study of Drug Use and the Youth Culture; 1972.
5. An Operationally-Based Information Support System for NDEP; in process.
6. General Research Corp., College and Communities Study; in process.
7. General Research Corp., Minigrant Study; in process.
8. BRX/Shelley, "What Works and Why" project (Fifty Successful Practices); in process.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Environmental Education

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Environmental Education Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-516)	1974

Funding History:	**Year**	**Authorization**	**Appropriation**
FY	1971	$ 5,000,000	$ 2,000,000
	1972	15,000,000	3,514,000[1/]
	1973	25,000,000	3,180,000
	1974	25,000,000	2,000,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The purpose of environmental education is to help individuals perceive environments in their totalities, develop an understanding of environmental phenomena and problems, and to identify and support educational activities which can enhance environmental quality. The Environmental Education Act is intended to encourage and support the development of both nonformal and formal educational resources required to achieve these objectives among all age groups and sectors of the country.

The Act provides (1) broad authority for flexible, responsive support of environmental education development needs (rather than support of predesignated activities), (2) support for community group sponsored nonformal education projects, and (3) environmental training for persons in various fields other than education, including those in business, industry and government whose activities may effect environment policies and activities and hence quality.

The overall strategy of the Office of Environmental Education is to facilitate through technical assistance and grant funds (Environmental Education Act and other OE program authorities) the development of environmental education, e.g., environmental studies programs and educational resources devoted to educating and informing our citizens about environmental quality and ecological balance. This strategy involves (1) development of content and process through pilot projects, (2) the dissemination and transfer of effective materials and approaches through local and national demonstration projects, and (3) through funds other than the Environmental Education Act, support of operational programs,

---

[1/] Approximately $2 million withheld to cover backdated FY '72 grants.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY '73, grant funds amounting to about $1 million were used to support a total of 54 environmental education projects. These included resource material development, personnel training, and community education in urban, suburban and rural areas in 33 States and the District of Columbia. By kinds of projects the breakdown is as follows:

- a. Resource Materials Development -- 18
- b. Personnel Development -- 12
- c. Community Education -- 7
- d. Elementary and Secondary Education -- 2
- e. Minigrant Workshops -- 15

It is estimated that up to 2,000 people have been provided direct training through these projects. Projects funded under the Environmental Education Act during the past three years and those funded through other OE programs are being reviewed for possible dissemination. In addition, several projects focusing on specific environmental education content areas are planned. These projects will result in basic source materials suitable for technical assistance and general dissemination. The Office of Environmental Education has also developed a descriptive listing of all USOE funded environmental education programs throughout the country, and a similar listing of all programs supported by other Federal agencies.

Technical or non-monetary assistance activities have included (1) assisting OE, regional and headquarters, program administrators in developing resources and expertise, (2) establishing local and regional planning and information networks, and (3) assisting other Federal agencies interested in educational programs relating to environmental quality.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations

None at this time.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

- -- ERIC/USOE Project Survey Reports/Documents
- -- OE funded Project Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Health and Nutrition

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Section 808	1974

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1971	$ 10,000,000	$ 2,000,000
	1972	16,000,000	2,000,000
	1973	26,000,000	2,000,000
	1974	---	2,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the program is to demonstrate ways through which the gap between needs and delivery of nutrition and health services for low-income children can be narrowed by coordinating, focusing, and utilizing existing health, health-related and educational resources at the local level, especially Federally funded programs. Federal programs involved in these collaborative activities are HEW Children and Youth Projects, HEW Comprehensive Health Centers, NIMH Community Mental Health Centers, as well as OEO, Model Cities and Indian Health Service programs.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 71, the first eight demonstration projects were funded, reaching 10,600 children in 26 schools. In FY 72, these projects were continued and four new ones were added, bringing the number of children served up to more than 15,000 in 45 schools. In FY 73, all 12 projects were continued for another year.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Provisions for an individual evaluation are included in each project, and plans are being made by the project staffs for the collection of appropriate data. However, these evaluations will not be available until the projects are completed.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Interim and annual progress reports are available from all twelve projects.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAM

Program Name:

Dropout Prevention

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title VIII ESEA, Section 807	FY 1974

Funding History:	Year (FY)	Authorization	Appropriation
	1969	$30,000,000	$ 5,000,000
	1970	30,000,000	5,000,000
	1971	30,000,000	10,000,000
	1972	31,500,000	10,000,000
	1973	33,000,000	10,000,000
	1974	4,000,000	4,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The 1967 amendments to ESEA of 1965 established Title VIII, Section 807 to develop and demonstrate educational practices which show promise in reducing the number of children who fail to complete their elementary and secondary education. Funds are granted to local educational agencies to carry out in schools with high dropout rates and with high percentages of students from families with low-income, innovative demonstration projects aimed at reducing the dropout rate. The program was funded at $5 million beginning in FY 1969, at $10 million in FY 71 and 72; in FY 73 the operating level was $8.5 million. Nineteen projects and two one-year special projects have been funded, of which 9 are due to be refunded in FY 1974.

For the 1969-1971 period grants were awarded to ten school systems submitting the most imaginative proposals for reducing the number of secondary education students leaving school before graduating. For FY 1972 an additional nine grants were awarded. Each of the funded projects must demonstrate ways for reducing the dropout rates in their school systems as well as providing insights for possible replication of their projects in other school systems. For FY 1973 nineteen were continued at an estimated figure of 8.5 million dollars. For FY 1974, nine remaining projects, will be continued at an expected $4 million level.

Counseling services, staff training and curriculum or instructional revision were common activities to all projects. Fifteen projects conducted work-study or other vocational course; four offered special services for pregnant students; and fice placed major emphasis on parental involvement. One project provided a "Personal Development Center" in an off-school facility for holding informal sessions for students who were unable to relate to convention instruction.

In each funded project independent audits of evaluation and management designs were required for the purpose of determining the nature of management and program practices of project personnel. Auditors' interim and final reports, evaluation reports from each project, and the USOE personnel participation provide the basis for gaining insights into the operation and progress of each project.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 1973 nineteen projects were funded in the amount of $8.5 million. The total student participants population was 69,000. Data provided from the projects indicate that the dropout rate has been reduced in the target schools. In the ten original target schools 3,572 dropouts were reported during the 1968-69 school year as compared to 1427 reported in the 1972-73 school year. This indicates a 40% reduction in the number of dropouts during the four years of operation. The nine new projects reported 2,600 dropouts in 1970-71 as compared to 991 dropouts in 1972-73, a 47% reduction in two years of operation.

Information about the Dropout Prevention Program comes from two main sources: (1) the Consolidated Program Information Report which provides data primarily upon expenditures and program participation and (2) evaluation reports and individual audits on each local project. The evidence from these reports indicates that the Dropout Prevention Program is well-focused upon its target population and that most projects have been effective in reducing the dropout rate.

The Dropout Prevention Program has demonstrated that it is possible to reduce the dropout rate significantly in schools and school systems which structure themselves along an accountability model. Of the ten projects originally funded in FY 1969, data shows a 45.3% reduction in number of dropouts during a three year period for target groups. These trends are continuing. For nine additional projects funded in FY 1971, the dropout rate went from 12.4% to 8.7% in two years. Recent evaluation reports support these results. The Englewood, Colorado project reports that the dropout rate prior to institution of the project was 15%. During the first year of the project it was reduced to 5%. In the Fall River, Massachusetts project, the rate went from 15.2% to 10.7% in two years. They report also significant increases in reading achievement and self-concept, increased attendance, cooperative planning and decision-making on the part of students, teachers and administrators and parent involvement in decision-making. The Dayton, Ohio project reports that during the year prior to the initial funding of the project, the dropout rate was 18.1%. This year, the dropout rate for the target school was 7.7% but only 2.7% for the students in the dropout program. In Seattle, the project reduced dropout rates from 16.86% in the first year to 5.45% last year. Absenteeism dropped from 62.5% to 32%. At Riverton, Wyoming, the dropout rate has gone from 9.6% to 8.6% and an almost total absence of vandalism has been noted within the target population. At Oakland, California, Project MACK started with a dropout rate of 12%. The most recently reported rate was 6.5%. Class-cutting was reduced by half and school attendance improved. The Detroit project achieved a decrease of about 46% in the dropout rate during the four years of its existence. Absenteeism decreased by 6% during the past year and expulsions declined by 6%. In Baltimore, the average dropout rate for the public schools as a whole was 13.3%. At the target area for the dropout project, the rate was 12.8% and for the project participants only 6.8%. Attendance improved and 76.1% showed improvement in most achievement areas tested. At Tuskeegee, initial dropout rates of more than 13% are now close to zero because of a unique system of use of parent-counselor aides as attendance officers and counselors.

Gains in dropout reduction are attributed to multi-component approaches which include attempts to raise achievement levels in reading and mathematics, work-study programs involving private industry and other agencies, staff training, improved pupil personnel services, community involvement, and special classes for students considered most dropout prone. Annual dropout project staff leadership conferences have served to disseminate successful practices. A handbook of practices found most useful in reducing dropout has been prepared and is in publication.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An overall program evaluation is planned prior to the termination of the Title VIII program.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. FY 1973 reviews of the evaluation and audit reports from the nineteen dropout prevention program. -- OE
2. Consolidated Program Information Report -- OE
3. Final Evaluation Report, Project Outreach, August, 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

General Program Dissemination. Office of Public Affairs

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
General Education Provisions Act, Section 412	None

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1970	Indefinite	$1,600,000
	1971	"	500,000
	1972	"	400,000
	1973	"	400,000
	1974	"	-0-

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of General Program Dissemination is to make information available to the widest possible audience -- including the general population as well as professional educators -- about programs deriving from Office of Education supported research and practices. The funds are expended primarily through contracts for performing public information functions by means of various mass media and through meetings, conferences, or workshops. The purpose of these activities is to foster awareness of OE programs and to encourage individuals to take an active role in improving education in their communities. General Program Dissemination activities have been underway since FY 1970.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

Program effectiveness can best be illustrated by examples of the types of projects funded during FY 1973. These include sound filmstrip production on the Office of Education Regional Offices for showing to the general public by field office staff; production of a film on environmental education; distribution of radio and TV spots and of films on the Right to Read and early childhood education; and a public information campaign to stimulate student interest in seeking technical education. Available statistics indicate wide public contact of some of the products coming out of projects funded in FY 1970-7 Between August 1971 and December 31, 1973, the film, "The Right to Read" had been shown 55,364 times to an estimated total audience of 2,075, 369, and it has been telecast 1,521 times to 43,376,100 viewers at a time value of $171,711. Since May 1972, "The First Years Together," a film on early childhood education, has been shown 23,739 times to an estimated audience of 804,291. Telecasts of this film total 838, at a time value of $95,457, and an estimated viewership of

34

25,441,400. Five television spots on the Right to Read were released in April, May, and June of 1973. Since that time, a total of 15,529 telecasts (at a time value of $563,062) have been seen by an estimated audience of 692,397,000.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Evaluation is built into each individual project as part of the management process. No separate formal evalutations have been performed or are contemplated.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Informal "inhouse" assessments

I. Indian Education Programs

1. Revision of Impacted Areas as It Relates to Indian Children
2. Special Programs and Projects to Improve Educational Opportunities for Indian Children
3. Special Programs Relating to Adult Education for Indians

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Revision of Impacted Areas as it Relates to Indian Children
(Payments to LEA's for Indian Education)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Indian Education Act of 1972, Public Law 92-318, Part A	June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	FY 73	$196,177,204	$11,500,000
	FY 74	208,000,000	25,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies for elementary and secondary programs to meet the special educational needs of Indian children. Grants are made to applicant local educational agencies according to the number of Indian students enrolled and the State average per pupil expenditure. Programs funded by these grants are intended to improve educational opportunities for Indian children by providing additional teachers and teacher aides in the basic skill areas for reading and mathematics, new supportive services including home liaison and other guidances and counseling services, and bilingual/bicultural activities.

Program Scope:

Monies appropriated under Part A of the Indian Education Act are used to:

1. Award grants to local education agencies who provide free education to Indian children, and

2. Provide financial assistance to schools on or near reservations which are non-local educational agencies for more than three years.

For any fiscal year an amount not in excess of 5% of the amount appropriated for Part A will be expended for non-local educational agencies. The amount of the grant to which a local education agency is entitled is equal to the average per pupil expenditure for such agency multiplied by the sum of the number of Indian children served, determined by the Commissioner.

If the sums appropriated for any fiscal year for making payments under this title are not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which all local educational agencies are eligible to receive under this title for that fiscal year, the maximum amounts which all such agencies are eligible to receive under this title for such fiscal year shall be ratably reduced.

Data from the 1973 Indian enrollment/entitlement computation indicated that over 2,550 local educational agencies would be eligible for funding under Part A, Title IV, P.L. 92-318. During fiscal year 1973, 579 of these eligible agencies applied for funds to plan, develop, and/or operate programs designed to meet the special educational needs of Indian children. Of the applications received, 446 grants were awarded. (During fiscal year 1973, approximately 135,197 children were enrolled in LEA's receiving Part A grants.)

Program Effectiveness:

This program has been in operation only a few months and measures of effectiveness will not be available for some time. However, there is currently in the developmental stage an Indian Education Program Monitoring and Process Evaluation System. This system is designed to determine if the major programs under the Indian Education Act are meeting the goals and objectives specified in the law. In this regard, an assessment of known services and activities that Indians are presently receiving and projected to receive in conjunction with some broad measures of how successful the projects are in meeting their objectives is planned.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None at present.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program review materials

Program audits

Personnel interviews

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Programs and Projects to Improve Educational Opportunities for Indian Children

Legislation:

Indian Education Act of 1972
P.L. 92-318, Part B

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	FY 73	$25,000,000	$ 5,000,000
	FY 74	35,000,000	12,000,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The purpose of this program is to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects to test and demonstrate the effectiveness of programs for improving educational opportunities for Indian children, by providing services not otherwise available, and by assisting in the development and operation of preservice and inservice training programs for education personnel. Grants are made, upon receipt of applications and approval by the Commissioner of Education, to Indian tribes, organizations, and institutions, State and local educational agencies, and federally supported elementary and secondary schools for Indian children. The applications from Indian organizations, tribes, and other institutions fall into the general area of cultural and educational enrichment programs and services.

Program Scope:

During the fiscal year 1973, the Office of Education received 370 applications to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects with 51 being selected for funding. The projects approved dealt with developing bilingual/bicultural programs, development of instructional materials and media centers, compensatory education, cultural enrichment, dropout prevention, and vocational training.

Program Effectiveness:

This program has been in operation only a few months and measures of effectiveness will not be available for some time. However, there is currently in the developmental stage an Indian Education Program Monitoring and Process Evaluation System. This system is designed to determine if the major programs under the Indian Education Act are meeting the goals and objectives specified in the law. In this regard, an assessment of known services and activities that Indians are presently receiving and projected to receive in conjunction with some broad measures of how successful the projects are in meeting their objectives is planned.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None at present

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program review materials

Program audits

Personnel interviews

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Programs Relating to Adult Education for Indians

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Indian Education Act of 1972 Public Law 92-318, Part C	June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	FY 73	$5,000,000	500,000
	FY 74	8,000,000	3,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to improve the educational opportunities for adult Indians by making grants to State and local educational agencies, and to Indian tribes, institutions, and organizations. The projects should be designed to plan for, test and demonstrate effectiveness of programs for providing adult education for Indians. The projects are intended to assist in the establishment and operation of programs which are designed to stimulate the provision of basic literacy opportunities to all Indian adults to qualify for a high school equivalency certificate in the shortest period of time feasible. Grants are made, upon receipt of applications and approval by the Commissioner of Education. Federally supported elementary and secondary schools are not recipients of grants for adult Indian programs.

Program Scope:

During fiscal year 1973, the Office of Education received 69 applications to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects with 10 being selected for funding. The applications from Indian organizations, tribes and other institutions consisted of planned pilot and demonstration projects designed to improve the employment and educational opportunities of adult Indians. More specifically, the applications approved dealt with developing projects to enable Indian adults to obtain high school diplomas, improve their communication skills, and participate in career development programs.

Program Effectiveness:

This program has been in operation only a few months and measures of effectiveness will not be available for some time. However, there is currently in the developmental stage an Indian Education Program Monitoring

314

and Process Evaluation System. This system is designed to determine if the major programs under the Indian Education Act are meeting the goals and objectives specified in the law. In this regard, an assessment of known services and activities that Indians are presently receiving and projected to receive in conjunction with some broad measures of how successful the projects are in meeting their objectives is planned.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None at present

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program review materials

Program audits

Personnel interviews